



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

19980812 111

10
106
A66

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-041

CONTENTS

27 SEPTEMBER 1988

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

- Krasnodar Kraykom Chief Polozkov Assesses July 29 CPSU CC Plenum
[V. Udachin; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 3 Aug 88] 1
- BSSR Chief Discusses Party Conference, Agricultural Issues
[Ye. Ye. Sokolov; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 12 Jul 88] 7

MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

- 'SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA' Announces Changes in Staff, Policy
[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 28 Jun 88] 12

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

- Return to Principles of 1918 RSFSR Constitution Advocated *[B. Topornin; IZVESTIYA, 11 Jul 88]* 14

CULTURE

- Pro-Stalin Critic of 'Children of the Arbat' Rapped *[S. Rassadin; OGONEK No 20, 14-21 May 88]* 16
- Critic Scores Pro-Stalinist Writings in Literary Journals *[T. Ivanova; OGONEK No 24, 11-18 Jun 88]* 23
- OGONEK Tells Story Behind Romm's Films on Lenin, Stalin
[A. Bernshteyn; OGONEK No 25, 18-25 Jun 88] 30

REGIONAL ISSUES

- Roy Medvedev on Khrushchev's 1957 Consolidation of Political Control
[R. Medvedev; ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 25, 18-24 Jun 88] 35
- Medvedev on Khrushchev's 1964 Fall From Power
[R. Medvedev; ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 27, 2-8 Jul 88] 37
- Latvian Writers' Union Highlights Republic's Nationality Problems 41
- Pugo Addresses Plenum *[LATINFORM; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 2 Jun 88]* 41
- Selected Speeches at Plenum *[LATINFORM; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 10 Jun 88]* 48
- Officials Review Latvian Ecology Issues at Press Conference
[P. Manko, V. Smirnov; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 18 May 88] 70
- Chairman on Plans of Latvian Environmental Protection Committee
[E. Lapidus; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Jun 88] 76
- Azerbaijani Official on Plans to Improve Publishing for NKAO
[N. Ibragimov; Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 4 Jun 88] 78
- More on Uzbek Intersovkhov Feud, Police Injuries *[S. Pastukhov; PRAVDA, 13 Jun 88]* 80
- Uzbek Writers' Union Issues Appeal for Water Conservation *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 25 Jun 88]* 85
- Uzbek Academicians Recommend Measures to Save Aral Sea
[E. Yu. Yusupov, S.K. Ziyadullayev; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 28 Jun 88] 86
- Uzbek Scientists Urge Water Conservation 'Until Arrival of Siberian Water'
[K. Lapkin, O. Lebedev, V. Dukhovnyy; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 29 Jun 88] 89
- Aral Sea Committee Blasts Motives, Veracity of Uzbek Scientists' Article
[P. Shermukhamedov, Yu. Kovalev, S. Mirzayev; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 7 Jul 88] 91
- Uzbek Mine Loses Court Case, Must Pay Kolkhoz for Environmental Damage
[Yu. Kruzhilin, N. Shulepina; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 5 Jun 88] 93
- Uzbek CC Details Plans to Increase Uzbek-Tajik Ties *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 26 Jun 88]* 94
- 'Popular Front' Founder on Estonian Nationalism, Ethnic Tensions
[E. Kekelidze; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 17 Jun 88] 98
- Scientists Summarize Moldavian Environmental Issues
[F. Trishin; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 18 Jun 88] 100
- UkSSR Procurator on Environmental Legal Actions in Ukraine
[P.G. Osipenko; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 25 Jun 88] 101

Krasnodar Kraykom Chief Polozkov Assesses July 29 CPSU CC Plenum

18000603a Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Aug 88 pp 1, 3

[Interview of I. K. Polozkov, by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondent V. Udachin, Krasnodar Kray: "Answering for the Job and for Inactivity: I. K. Polozkov, First Secretary of the Party's Krasnodar Kraykom, Discusses the Results of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum."]

[Text] Immediately after his return from Moscow, Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov, first secretary of the CPSU Krasnodar Kraykom, held a meeting with administrators of the city and rayon party organizations and chairmen of the city and rayon ispolkoms and RAPO, and told them about the Plenum and the urgent tasks evolving from its decisions. Then we met. The first question was the natural one: what are your impressions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Ivan Kuzmich?

[Answer] We awaited that Plenum with particular impatience, because the goals of the 19th Party Conference must be translated into practice deeds immediately. However, complete clarity prevailed for by no means all the questions. And it is a good thing that the Politburo decided to introduce that clarity and, without losing time on the march, to begin the restructuring of the party apparatus and the country's political system. I was impressed by the rapid preparation of the Plenum, which preparation was carried out without any delays or procrastinations, but which was at the same time very thorough, and was also impressed by the hard-hitting, well argued report given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. I might also mention another peculiarity of that report—its repleteness with life, its high degree of time-responsiveness, if you will. When did the letter from the Gorkiy kolkhoz chairmen appear in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA?

[Question] 28 July.

[Answer] Well, the Plenum was held on 29 July, and that letter was used in the report. The Plenum adopted concrete documents which contained a well-substantiated, clearcut program of concrete actions. The resolutions concerning the practical work of implementing the decisions of the party conference, concerning the reports and elections at party organizations, and concerning the basic trends in the restructuring of the party apparatus are small in volume, but they are packed with constructive ideas that induce people to take immediate action. They do not contain any slogans or bombast. The Central Committee is just serving as an example for us: let's not lose time, since a rather large amount of it has already been lost. Let's go to work. Herein lies the chief political significance of the Plenum. And I would like to direct attention to yet another factor. The alarm concerning the slow progress of the perestroika—an alarm that the Politburo expressed very visibly and painfully in

the report—will become known, in my opinion, to every Communist. That alarm must be conveyed to everyone and must induce them to take decisive actions.

[Question] In your opinion, did the Plenum become a continuation of the conference—from the point of view of the sharpness of the discussion, the confrontation of opinions, and the fever pitch?

[Answer] Yes, with regard to the openness of discussion and the critical mood, the July Plenum definitely continued the conference. I was greatly impressed by statements made by my associates—I. S. Boldyrev, first secretary of the Stavropol Kraykom; A. F. Ponomarev, first secretary of the Belgorod Obkom; N. F. Tatarchuk, first secretary of the Kalinin Obkom; and ministers A. S. Systsov and V. A. Bykov. Those statements posed the problems in a sharp but constructive manner. Every speaker searched for and recommended ways to resolve the questions that have come to a head. I might note that the Central Committee itself increases the efficiency of the discussion and serves as an example of work with critical comments. They are immediately taken into consideration, and deadlines are assigned, as well as the persons who are responsible for execution. This instills confidence in all of us: it is necessary to make a statement, to speak the truth, however bitter it may be. The sharp criticism does not have any consequences. I feel that myself. After the critical statements at the congress, at the plenums, and at the conference, I do not feel any prejudice toward myself. The work atmosphere at the Central Committee is imbued with the spirit of party comradeship.

[Question] But what must be done to assure that this spirit, this atmosphere of creative discussion and of exacting criticism, become the norm in the life of the primary party organizations? And not just at some time in the future, but right now, in the course of the reports and elections that are beginning at the party organizations. Because the current campaign to hear reports and hold elections has a special mission, a mission that, so to speak, is of fateful importance...

[Answer] In any case the Plenum's decisions instill hope for this. It is a good thing that those decisions indicate specific steps to accelerate the processes of perestroika. For example, it is planned to reorganize the party agencies by the end of the year, in the course of the campaign to hear reports and hold elections. People see that deed follows word. This is an important political factor. Because previously the decisions frequently were left "hanging in the air," and were not fulfilled. But now, things get done immediately! It is a large and unusual job—to reorganize the work of the party agencies, from the Central Committee to the local committees, to change their structure... Just think! By the new year the party committees at all levels will be operating under completely new conditions!

This is very important, since there will then be a fundamental transformation of the political system, and there remain, until the end of the five-year plan, only two years, and those two years are probably the most complicated ones, inasmuch as it will be necessary to complete the fundamental economic reform and to nullify the action of the inhibition mechanism. It is precisely in the course of the campaign to hear reports and hold elections that we will have to cause our cadres to make an irreversible change in their way of thinking and to convince Communist Party members and administrators at all levels that the perestroika is a real matter, that it has been yielding its results, and we will definitely have to get people moving toward practical actions.

An idea that was expressed as a constantly recurring theme through the entire report at the Plenum was the idea of activating the Communist Party members and the primary party organizations. In order to increase their rate of activity, it is necessary for form the elected agencies in a new way. The people who must come into leadership positions are people of action, people who are convinced champions of revolutionary reforms.

Today, more than ever before, we need restless people. At times they are not very convenient in our measured life, inasmuch as they disturb our conscience and demand a lot. But without that exactingness we will never get out of the stagnant condition. Another good thing about the party conference is that fact that a spirit of rebelliousness, a spirit of the confrontation of opinions, prevailed there. If we can conduct the reports and elections in the same key, if we can find leaders, if we elect combat agencies that are charged up to carry out practical deeds, then we shall see illuminated the true essence of the party organizations and the party committees as agencies of political leadership. Then many of the questions that currently arise because of a lack of knowledge, a lack of understanding, or a lack of the necessary experience, will be removed.

When the functions are being divided, doubts appear: what do the party organizations engage in? The administrators of many of them have become somewhat confused and do not see the essence specifically of political work. Instead, they became accustomed to hearing "about the rate of preparation" and "about the introduction of measures," and felt that they had done a big job. Today, however, it is much more important to involve Communists in the active processes of perestroika, and to promote them everywhere to the front line in the renovation of life. I am worried, for example, about why there are so few Communists in cooperatives. Why are they not marching in the vanguard of this very promising movement?

[Question] Especially, Ivan Kuzmich... I was at a party meeting at the Proletariy Plant in Novorossiysk, where Ashot Khachaturyan, the chief of the machine-repair shop, was elected as candidate delegate to the 19th Party

Conference. When, in his program, he suggested the idea of creating a cooperative at the shop, he was accused of practically having self-seeking motivations...

[Answer] That's right! Recently N. V. Vorobyev, first secretary of the Tikhoretsk Gorkom, told me about the following situation. A milkmaid assumed a family contract, but various obstructions were put in her way. Incidentally, even in the rental collectives there are few Communists. So we ought to be worried about the rate of the campaign to hear reports and hold elections. And at the meetings we must ask the Communists outright: what is your role in the new undertakings, in readjusting the economic and political mechanism?

It is important to take a nontraditional approach also to the organizing of meetings. I have happened to be present at several of them. You would simply be astonished to see the extent to which the secretary had been formalized. Even according to the manner in which he opens the meeting and conducts it and how he is afraid to enter into polemics, the meeting has a stale smell. It is necessary to make a lot of changes here... And we guarantee success if we, the workers at the kraykom, the Adygey Obkom, and the party's gorkoms and raykoms, will go to the primary organizations and help them to organize report-and-election meetings like this. Not in the previous understanding—not helping them to prepare the report, the list of speakers, and the list of candidates for election to the elective agency, but helping them to conduct the meetings in a truly human, a truly new way. We shall achieve a situation in which the secretaries reject the dogmatic form of report in which, according to the old canons, there is an introductory part "in order to get a running start," a little bit of an analysis of the economy, a little bit about politics—just a little bit about everything... In a report it is necessary first of all to describe the work performed by every member of the buro or the committee, beginning with the secretary, from the point of view of promoting the perestroika. Then, obviously, people will begin to talk, and discussion will arise about the main, fundamental problems in the economic reform, the development of democratization and glasnost, and the introduction of a spirit of party comradeship. It will be obvious who is who. And you can be assured that the people who are elected to the party buro or committee will be ones who are not indifferent, ones who know how to move perestroika ahead.

[Question] In the campaign that is beginning, it is planned to hold alternative elections on a competitive basis. They will give the campaign a new quality, a warm, human nuance, and will definitely increase people's self-interestedness...

[Answer] We recently were reconvinced of that. The first secretary of the Apsheronskiy Rayon Committee was asked to be an instructor at the Academy of Social Sciences, under CPSU Central Committee. It was necessary to elect a new first secretary. But whom? There were

three local candidates—the second secretary; the chairman of the rayispolkom; and the chairman of the people's control committee. We knew that they might be recommended. We chatted with them, and we asked for the opinion of the raykom members, many of whom were in favor of it. But when I chatted with Second Secretary A. Shcherbina, the most likely candidate for the position of first secretary, I asked him the direct question: what is currently the weakest link in the rayon? Aleksey Grigoryevich gave an equally direct answer: food supplies. He was educated as a timber engineer... He used at work at enterprises in the lumber industry and, at the raykom, he was responsible for that branch. If Shcherbina had been elected as first chairman, that, in general, would not have been a mistake. But what about the most painful point—food supplies? Agriculture in the rayon, we must admit honestly, is lying on its side. We conferred at the buro and we had different opinions about whether an alternative candidacy was required. We needed a person with experience in party work, a person who knows his sphere, and, of course, agriculture. We considered about ten candidates and stopped on Yu. A. Zagoruyko, chairman of the Temryukskiy Rayon Ispolkom. Previously he worked as a sovkhoz director, a raykom instructor, a partkom secretary, and the chief of the rayon agricultural administration. People had a good opinion about him. And so we decided to go to the election with him, obviously without rejecting other contenders.

No, the kraykom did not force Zagoruyko on anyone. He went to the rayon ahead of time, visited the farms, and met the aktiv. No one could give any guarantee that he would be elected first secretary. And at the plenum itself, the scales wavered. And do you know who caused a major turning point in the course of the plenum? L. Rudenko, worker at the Tverskoy Sovkhoz. She said, "Just take a look at the presidium, at our chiefs. You can see from their appearance that they never leave their offices. But now look at Zagoruyko. He is sunburned, so it's obvious that he drives around the fields. But I never saw the chairman of our rayispolkom on the animal farm even once." Rudenko turned the plenum around. Zagoruyko gave a statement about his program, speaking in simple, concrete terms. And in the secret balloting he won the absolute majority of votes. This situation convinces me that people will not make a mistake, because they also want things to go better.

But there is another fact in this same story that is alarming. The aktiv and the administrative cadres, including certain members of the raykom buro, behaved strangely. The predominant feature in their behavior was the inertia of the past: what we definitely need, they said, is "our own" man. Why "your own" man? Well, they said, we know him very well. He is a capable person, he has not gone deeply into agricultural matters, and consequently you can live rather well with him on the job. But, on the other hand, the workers need a restless person. Hence the conclusion: when staffing elective agencies it is necessary to give the preference to workers

and kolkhoz members. As has been demonstrated by practical life, they are most consistent in defending the interests of perestroyka.

[Question] In addition, an elective agency consisting of people like that will not allow the apparatus to trample them. Because doesn't it seem to you that, to this day, it is precisely in the apparatus segment that many good initiatives are stifled, even including information itself about the progress of perestroyka?

[Answer] That is obvious. Here is a fresh example. Recently I was at the Rassvet Kolkhoz in Anapskiy Rayon. At the political day I discussed the party conference. Then I dropped in at the construction brigade that was building the cow barns. Incidentally, for some reason it had not been invited to the meeting. They said, "Since we were not asked to come, could you please tell us now about perestroyka?" So I explained how it was proceeding in the upper echelon, and then I told them that it would be better if they would tell me what people in the brigade thought about perestroyka. And a worker told me everything that I had attempted to express at the meeting. Only he did it more succinctly and more clearly. "Give us the chance to be the bosses, give us a project, an estimate, and materials. Allow us to conclude contracts with subcontractors. Then we will hand over the project 'under lock and key.' What we have economized is ours, and we will pay for whatever extra we have expended. This is a simple system of cost accountability that we have been completely unable to get accepted in construction. Why? Because the apparatus at the SMU [construction-and-installation administration] and the trusts stands like a solid wall on the path of cost accountability." The situation is well-known. I regularly visit D. Zhovtenko's brigade, from the Krasnodarproyektstroy Association, which is building a children's hospital in the kray center. And I know what obstacles the "office" places in the brigade's way, and how afraid it is to assume responsibility and conclude a contract.

And the same situation pertains in the development of the family and rent contract. Wherever it is introduced, the question arises: how many specialists do we have to have, and how much do we pay them, and for what? It is easier to live in an office when one receives a salary. So that is the segment that has been holding perestroyka back. This has to be discussed openly with the Communist specialists. They must be required to take active part in perestroyka. It is precisely here that an inroad must be made in course of the reports and elections. If we do not change over to new forms of labor, to complete cost accountability, there will be no perestroyka. The worker, the kolkhoz member, will not become the owner. But we need precisely that kind of owner. And there is a tremendous amount of work to be done...

[Question] The people in many party organizations understand this. But you will agree that they are as yet in the minority. I remember that you yourself once complained that many primary organizations proved to be even less receptive to the perestroyka than the labor collectives.

[Answer] Much depends here upon the raykoms. This year the structure of the party committees will be reconsidered, and it is correct that the Central Committee Plenum granted the kraykoms and obkoms the right to resolve independently the questions of personnel and structure. I think that we shall not reduce the size of the raykoms. They are rather small—from 12 to 18 persons—and each takes care of from 100 to 350 primary organizations. So we do not have anything to reduce. The raykoms will have to be reinforced and we shall have to analyze what they must engage in. I can visualize a raykom with two departments. The first is the organizational party work department, which is supposed to interact primarily with the primary organizations, and the second is the political, ideological department. It is supposed to guarantee the restructuring of the mass-political work. Taking advantage of the right granted by the Plenum, it is necessary during the current year to staff the raykoms with experienced party workers, and at the same time with young people who have not yet been encrusted by formalism, people who like to "dig deep" into things, and to send them to assist specific party organizations, their secretaries, and elected agencies. It is important for them to become advisors, mentors, and "complacency-busters." The most important thing for the apparatus is concreteness in work. Then the raykom's authority will grow.

I would like to give an example. For a long time Maykopskiy Rayon in Adygey has been lagging behind seriously. Currently V. V. Krokhmal was elected first secretary there. In the past he was a kraykom instructor, and more recently the first deputy chairman of the Adygey Oblast Agroprom. He is a person with a new way of economic thinking, a person who is free of the load of the past. He knows how to bring the rayon out of its breakdown, and where to tell people to go. He did not force all the farmers to change over to the rent contract. Instead, he convinced them that they should do that. They trusted him and now the entire rayon is operating on the basis of the rent contract. It was the first in the Kuban. But N. G. Pedan, first secretary of the neighboring Giaginskiy Rayon Committee, who would seem to be an experienced party worker, is becoming more cautious, and in addition presents his caution in "theoretical" form. But Giaginskiy Rayon is not on a par with foothill Maykopskiy Rayon. It is situated on a plain, on thick chernozem soils, but, essentially speaking, it has been marking time in the production of output. I think that during this report-and-election campaign it is necessary to carry out a bolder search and promotion of the new type of administrators and to "push ahead" those who think in old categories. M. S. Gorbachev discussed this rather clearly in his report at the Plenum.

[Question] The selection of the raykom secretaries is the prerogative of the kraykom. What, in your opinion, will its structure become? To what extent will it promote a situation in which the party apparatus becomes an active force in perestroika?

[Answer] I am deeply convinced that the kraykom apparatus must be considerably reduced. We shall not lose anything by that. And the crux of the matter is not even in any improvement of the old structure, but in the creation of a new one, with strong links. It seems to me that the kraykom must have a strong organizational party work department that would guarantee the greater participation of the primary organizations, raykoms, and gorkoms, and would bring them onto the road of political leadership. There must be a strong ideological department. We currently have a propaganda department, a culture department, and a science department, but we have not been engaging properly in any of those spheres. Under conditions of democratization it is necessary to change the interrelationships with the creative and scientific organizations and with the institutions of higher learning, and to seek new approaches in ideological work, in propaganda, and in the work of the mass information media.

The conference brought the food problem out into the foreground. This is political task number one—consequently, we need a department for the party's agrarian policy, especially in the Kuban. I feel that we need a state legal department, because we will have to perform a tremendous amount of work to create a legal state. Universal legal education, the reinforcement of socialist legality, court reform, the legal interrelationships between the soviets and the enterprises, and many other problems cannot be allowed to go unaffected by party influence.

[Question] When you spoke at the party conference, Ivan Kuzmich, you emphasized the need to create a cadre policy department in the apparatus. How do you substantiate that need?

[Answer] At the present time, work with cadres is, essentially speaking, an unworked lode. Each of the branch departments worked with cadres in its own way. During this report-and-election campaign we are proceeding with alternative elections. And they will indeed be alternative, but I am afraid that they will not prove to be competitive everywhere. You and I were present at the election of the chief of Krasnodarproyektstroy. You wrote about that in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. But there was no such competition! The contenders were not equal, and two of them withdrew their candidacy. At the Tenzopribor Plant the director also withdrew his candidacy. "Why is there a need for them to discuss my personality?" What was it that bothered him, a rather good administrator? Was it pride or false vanity? In Sovetskiy Rayon a department head at the Krasnodar Gorkom was not elected to the position of secretary-ideologist, and she interpreted that fact as the complete collapse of her life, and was practically on the point of leaving party work. However, I do not preclude the possibility that at forthcoming city and rayon party conferences there will not be any competition. In any instance, it will not occur everywhere. One person will withdraw his candidacy, and another will decide not to

"promote" himself, because he sees an obvious loss. Therefore it necessary for us to convince the party, soviet, and economic workers that from now on the elections will be a competition—that is our reality, our natural condition. And it is necessary to know how to fight for the position of an administrator. To know how to fight by using a knowledge of the situation at hand, by using the ability to see the goal, and by knowing how to involve the collective. From the recent history of the kray's party organization we know that many things have been sold—assignments, titles, and awards. For some reason, people did not express any indignation about these outrageous situations. But today, when people have been given the opportunity to show what they are capable of, and to prove this by their honesty and selflessness, people are not used to this and say that they are afraid... Consequently, the main factor today in cadre work is to carry out a search ahead of time, to develop and train candidates for the alternative, competitive elections as early as the next campaign. The rotation of cadres must proceed constantly. The well that provides us with cadres must not run dry.

And the organization that must work with this active well is the cadre policy department, which is obliged to reject completely the customary nomenklatura bureaucratic merry-go-round. What will that department be like? My opinion is that such a department could be a commission (the crux of the matter is not in its name) made upon of the most experienced and more authoritative members of the kray committee. Perhaps under the chairmanship of the first secretary or a secretary who is specially in charge of cadres. A small apparatus consisting of the members of an elected agency must be attached to that commission. The commission would work primarily with the kraykom departments, would stand over them, and, in the name of the elected agency, would hold them accountable for the work with cadres.

[Question] Do you mean that this is one of those steps that will increase the role of the elected agency?

[Answer] We are also taking other steps. First, we have taken it as a rule to ask constantly for the opinion of the kraykom members with regard to various questions in the life of the kray's party organization. Within the near future we shall make it a rule in bureau practice that, unless the kraykom members have made their finding, there will be absolutely no submitting of a question for review that pertains to that rayon organization which they represent in the elected agency. We are reorienting the view of the apparatus toward the figure of the kraykom member. If he has arrived in the organization, then be so kind as to meet with him, keep him informed, and ask his advice. I think that even in the kraykom apparatus the member of the elected agency must feel that he is not a guest, but the host. We intend to provide offices for them, so that the kraykom member can come there, work comfortably, become acquainted with the documents, and participate in bureau sessions. I am not speaking about involving them broadly in the preparation of plenums.

Things have already been moved off the standstill in this regard. I may be repeating myself, but today, before the beginning of the reports and elections, we have to carry out a persistent search to determine who should be elected, and to what agencies. You can see how many new names appeared during the election of delegates to the 19th party congress. I encountered many of them for the first time and I was truly gratified to get to know them. They are restless, curious, searching people. And so I ask the question: why, when electing people to the soviets or to the party agencies, did we always fill the positions with one and the same people? Look at M. I. Klepikov. How many duties have been loaded onto him! He has had to run away from assignments, delegations, and trips. His calling is to grow grain, not to hold sessions. I think that, when holding elections to raykoms, gorkoms, the obkom and the kraykom, and the soviets, we will strive for a situation in which one and the same people are not elected to different agencies. Not only will the size of our aktiv increase, but, in addition, our activists will no longer be overworked.

[Question] Reducing the size of the party apparatus is a question that is not completely painless. And we may as well admit that we do have in the kraykom certain attributes of apathy and depression. How can jobs be found for people, where, and with the greatest benefit?

[Answer] I don't see any tragedy here. Is the reinforcing of the cadres of the raykoms with the workers who are being released from the kraykom really so bad? It will be necessary to carry out a major reorganization of the soviets. The most active apparatus workers who have had experience in soviet work, of whom there are a rather large number, will have to be returned to the soviets. We shall send the young, promising workers who, however, have not attended school in economic or party-political work, to primary organizations and labor collectives. Reinforcing the low-level link that is closest to people is the primary concern!

[Question] But won't the same thing happen that happened at one time when the administration of agriculture was being reorganized? The chief of the kray agricultural administration reported at the ministry board that practically hundreds of specialists went to the farms. The editorial office has given the assignment of "reflecting" that experience. I conducted a search but I found almost no one.

[Answer] I might add that at the present time 600 persons have been released at Agroprom. Fewer than ten people have gone to the farms. Of course it is necessary to take an individual approach to every comrade who is released, and to take his opinion into consideration. Quite recently I was at the electrical-measurement instruments plant, and the people there also asked about the reduction of the apparatus. They issued the invitation: come to us and we'll find work for everyone. Recently I met the kraykom apparatus and I calmed them down by saying, "Unemployment does not

threaten you if you have the desire to work." Whoever, under the conditions of perestroyka, can work with the greatest return on his efforts, who sees the ways to change his style, must be kept in the apparatus. The conference unambiguously stated that the party is the sole force that can guarantee the perestroyka. We must increase its authority.

[Question] You talked about that at the conference...

[Answer] And the question that arises in my mind is: doesn't this encroach upon the well-established tradition, when the party committee secretary considers it his good fortune to be the elected as kolkhoz chairman or plant director? If we say that a party organization must be headed by the most experienced, the most authoritative party worker, then why do we not increase the prestige of that category? This is a question for the Central Committee, but I am convinced that it deserves attention.

[Question] We might recall the work practice of the Central Committee party organizers, which proved its value during difficult times.

[Answer] I have already come across that and I can give examples. But we still have things to think about. We shall not disregard people's material self-interestedness. And yet the difference in the earnings of a party committee secretary and a kolkhoz chairman is a factor of 3. Therefore the striving of the secretary to become a chairman is natural. It is necessary to make the earnings of a secretary closer to the wages paid to an administrator or a person who has been promoted to party work, if only to allow him to maintain his previous earnings if he loses it. Because he will actually lose it more frequently than acquire it. And just imagine a plant director as a gorkom department chief. His associates would go to him for completely different reasons—for advice or help. That, then, would be the beginning of perestroyka in the party.

[Question] You might note, Ivan Kuzmich, that in our discussion we have left completely untouched the economic topic. Was that accidental or completely natural? I am surprised, because we have a very complicated harvesting operation, and the apparatus of the kraykom, and even of the agricultural department, is on the spot. Have we not had in the Kuban the division of functions among the party, soviet, and economic agencies?

[Answer] It is too soon to speak about an actual division of functions. But there has been an encouraging shift. Yes, the harvesting of grain crops is extremely difficult. Last year 100,000 hectares a day were threshed, but current, on the recent sunny days alone, we have begun threshing 50,000 hectares. The reaping is coming to an end. The kraykom, naturally, has kept an eye on it, but it did not interfere. The krayispolkom and the kray Agroprom have been engaging in it very thoroughly and in a

well-qualified manner, and it has been in the extraordinary situation that we did not have the need to take over the guardianship of them. Because, who should we be guardians of? Krayispolkom chairman N. I. Kondratenko and kray Agroprom chairman Ye. Ya. Nazarov are former kray secretaries, and Nazarov's deputies are former first secretaries of raykoms. Does that mean that they have less party responsibility than I do? But we are not satisfied with the work of the party organization at the kray Agroprom, where there are 600 workers. We are currently working on this.

[Question] The Plenum deemed it desirable for the soviet and party agencies in the outlying areas to develop and carry out specific measures to improve the providing of people with foodstuffs. What is being undertaken by the administrative agencies in the leading agrarian region of the republic in this direction?

[Answer] We are developing the Comprehensive Program for Increasing the Production of Foodstuffs and Improving the Supplying of Them to the Public of Krasnodar Kray During the Period Until the Year 2000. I think that is a major party question. It is paradoxical, but a fact: with regard to per-capita consumption of the basic foodstuffs, other than vegetables and fruits, Kuban is lagging behind the average indicators for the republic, despite the increase in their production. Last year the kray produced 33 percent of the republic's volume of canned vegetables and fruits; 70 percent of the green peas; 26 percent of the sugar; 57 percent of the quick-frozen output; and 39 percent of grape juice; and there were increased purchases of grain, meat, milk, vegetables, eggs, and wool. The Kuban provides much to the union-republic fund, but also loses much of the output that has been grown. RSFSR Gosplan and Gosagroprom insist on increasing the production of output, but now there is a second paradox: the more we produce, the more we lose. Because we deliver not output, but raw materials from which, because of our methods of delivery, very little can be preserved. No matter how many table grapes we grow, it is impossible in a week or two to harvest all of them and deliver them to all the consumers. Everything rests upon the base of storage and processing. The base has become hopelessly obsolete, the fixed assets have worn out, and the condition of the equipment, buildings, and structures has become simply menacing.

If one engages seriously in this sector of the agroindustry, builds a storage base, and remodels the processing enterprises, then, without increasing production, it would be possible to increase by 30 percent the output of finished food products, to expand their variety considerably, and to improve their quality. This is the critical factor in our program. It stipulates the creation in the kray of a machine-building industry for the food branches on the base of certain existing plants and the unification of them into an interbranch concern. It is planned to build small-scale processing shops, to provide for the scientific support of the program, and to improve the social

amenities in the rural areas. According to preliminary computations, when what has been planned is executed, the gross output of the agroindustrial complex in the kray will increase during a ten-year period by 20 billion rubles, including by 3 billion rubles in the year 2000. For the sake of this prospect, it is worthwhile to do some work. We see our goal in the fight for perestroika and for the improvement of the life of Soviet citizens.

5075

**BSSR Chief Discusses Party Conference,
Agricultural Issues**

18000575a Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in
Russian 12 Jul 88 p 1

[Article: "Statement of Ye. Ye. Sokolov at the Republic Seminar in Grodno Oblast"]

[Excerpts] Comrades!

Our seminar is completing its work. One can say with complete justification that its participants have enriched themselves with new experience in the intensification of agricultural production and the social restructuring of the rural areas.

This kind of mutual enrichment is of special importance today. The fulfillment of the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference requires of each of us the most thorough search for more effective, more innovative work forms and methods and the use of everything that helps to advance the cause of perestroika.

Today everyone—Soviet citizens, our friends abroad, and even the foes of socialism—recognize that the 19th Party Conference was a very important, pivotal event in the life of the party and the country, and in the consistent implementation of the line set down at the April 1985 Plenum of the Central Committee and the 27th CPSU Congress, aimed at the revolutionary renovation of Soviet society.

Without any exaggeration it can be said that the kind of discussion that occurred in the Palace of Congresses had not occurred in the party for almost six decades.

I have in mind the frankness, the Bolshevik directness, the concern that imbued all the statements about our present and our future about making the perestroika irreversible, and about making the Soviet citizen richer both spiritually and materially.

Speaking succinctly, the conference reflected the political atmosphere that is being asserted in our country and demonstrated the level of democratic development that has been achieved since April 1985. It was conducted in a truly Leninist spirit and it represented the triumph of high responsibility to the party, to the Soviet nation.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, which set the tone to the discussion, reflected the opinions and hopes of millions of Communists and nonparty members. It was distinguished by the creative use and development of Leninist theory concerning socialism, as applicable to the present-day conditions, by the depth of analysis of the situation that has development, by the constructive way in which the tasks were defined, and by unshakable faith in the strength of the party and the nation.

Of course you have noticed one of the peculiarities of the report: among the urgent, first-priority tasks Mikhail Sergeyevich mentioned the accelerated and unconditional resolution of the food problem, the saturation of the market with various high-grade commodities, and the providing of people with housing.

This attests once again to the fact that the concern for raising the nation's standard of living, for satisfying the ever-growing demands of Soviet citizens, has always been and continues to be the chief factor in the party's activities. This idea was a theme that carried through many statements made by delegates.

The very great importance of the conference consists in that the conference developed the keynote political position, and adopted a packet of resolutions that encompass essentially the entire complex of problems that confront the party and the government.

In the center of attention of the conference was the question of intensifying the role of the party as the political vanguard of the Soviet nation.

In the report and in the statements that were made, and also in the resolutions, one saw the manifestation of the firm conviction that the program of actions that was developed by the 27th CPSU Congress and that has already been enriched by the experience of perestroika retains all its entire strength.

The party has at its disposal the unconditional support of the nation, a nation that has adopted the policy of perestroika and that will not allow that policy to be turned back.

Through all the statements—and the participants of the conference also expressed a rather large number of critical remarks addressed to the party agencies, including the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo—one heard the passionately and exactly expressed desire to see the party even stronger, even more consolidated.

The taking of all steps to expand the perestroika front, the further democratization of society, and the reform of the political system, conference participants remarked, are impossible without the rebirth of the soviets as fully valid agencies of the sovereignty of the people.

Their formation and the organization of their activities will be carried out on a fundamentally new basis, that enables them to have the complete authority in the particular region.

But in order for the soviets to start operating properly, the conference deemed it necessary to reinforce them by the party's authority.

This was also evoked by the decision to the effect that the persons who, as a rule, should be elected to positions of soviet chairmen are the first secretaries of the appropriate party committees.

The conference emphasized with all its force that the party not only in content, but also in the methods of its activities, must be, in full measure, a Leninist-type party and must carry out its policy through the organizing, cadre, and ideological work with the observance of democratic principles of social life.

The conference delegates approved such steps to assure the further democratization of intraparty life as:

- the restoration in full measure of the Leninist principle of collegiate discussion and decision-making;
- the establishment of a single period of powers for elected party agencies (5 years), and the conducting, every 2-3 years, of party conferences with the right to renew by as much as 20 percent the makeup of the party committees;
- the filling of an elected position, starting with the forthcoming campaign to hear reports and hold elections, for not more than two terms in a row;
- the creation of the Central Monitoring and Auditing Commission of the CPSU and the appropriate agencies in the outlying areas; and other measures.

Comrades, these steps, expressed in the most compressed form, are the basic trends in the further democratization of social life and the reform of the political system.

We have now entered an especially critical stage—the stage of implementation of the conference decisions.

The party, soviet, and state agencies and public organizations must, without waiting for additional instructions, act without any vacillating, must begin to carry out those conference decisions which are linked with the day-by-day demands of people, with the satisfying of the first-priority needs of the population.

I think that this will also be promoted to a considerable degree by our seminar, by the use of the positive experience of the Grodno Oblast party organization.

The seminar participants had the opportunity to be convinced that the efforts of the workers in the oblast have been concentrated on accelerating the changeover of agriculture to the intensive path of development, on the strengthening of the economy on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and on the resolution on that basis of the problems of the social reorganization of the rural areas.

We have visited many farms and have seen how the cadres and the agricultural workers in Grodno Oblast have been working.

And, comrades, you may note that none of them have cited various kinds of so-called objective difficulties. None of them have put the blame on poor material-technical support, unfavorable weather conditions, etc. The people have been working creatively, purposefully, in an initiatory manner.

Why, then, can people not work in this way also in those rayons, on those farms in the republic, where things, as the expression goes, have not been moving along, but have just been lying down? How are they any poorer?

In equipment? No!

In fertilizers? No!

In cadres? Also no!

The entire question is in the attitude to the job at hand, in responsibility for the assigned work sector.

Our seminar has shown that the secret of success for the workers of Grodno Oblast lies in the opening up of the potential of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes on the basis of the development of intrafarm cost accountability, the introduction of the contract, of high efficiency in vegetable and animal husbandry, and in the reinforcement of the ties with science.

At the 19th Party Conference it was noted that all these things are critical links in the present-day agrarian policy.

There is no doubt that the experience of the Grodno Oblast party organization that was studied during the course of the seminar will be a good support in our further work to accelerate the resolution of the food problem.

Comrades! We have now begun the second half of the 12th Five-Year Plan. And it is symbolic that it is precisely at this turning point that the 19th CPSU Conference was held, a conference whose decisions are deepening the party's course aimed at perestroika and will help to refine and activate that mechanism of interaction of economic, political, administrative, and spiritual factors that will make it possible to move forward the entire cause of socialist renovation.

Perestroyka will acquire true value in people's eyes only when they obtain the opportunity to live better, when—I repeat—they will be richer both materially and spiritually.

In two and a half years, positive shifts have been noted in all spheres. I mentioned certain figures to confirm this in my statement at the 19th Party Conference. I would like to add two more. During the first half of the five-year plan the republic sold the government 53 percent of the meat and 55 percent of the milk in the plan for the entire five-year period.

And, of course, it was pleasant for all of us to hear from the mouth of the General Secretary of our party's Central Committee a good word concerning the workers of our republic.

But we should ask ourselves, "Have we done everything that we could have and should have done?" Because praise directed at us means not that we are working well or have risen to some high level, but that other regions have not yet developed their full strength. And all they have to do is apply themselves a little bit and activate their reserves, and we will rapidly prove to be among the laggards.

That is why we must make today the only correct conclusion: each of us, in his own specific work sector, must do a substantial amount of additional work, must operate in a purposeful, initiatory, and modern manner.

At the conference it was stated directly: raising the rural areas is the holy duty of all Soviet citizens.

Machine builders and chemists, transportation workers and construction workers, scientists and cultural figures have been called upon to make a real contribution to carrying out this task. In a word, no one today can remain aloof from the resolution of the food problem. But, naturally, the chief and decisive role belongs to the workers in the fields and on the animal farms, to the workers in the agroindustrial complex.

In the reports of Comrade Kletskov and Comrade Khusainov and the statements made by seminar participants, mention was made of many reserves for increasing the rates of increase in food production. Actually, we still have a rather large number of bottlenecks. But the crux of the matter lies not only in eliminating them. This, obviously, will guarantee an increase, but I venture to assure you, it is an insignificant one. The chief thing is to make a clear-cut determination in the work areas that are capable of yielding a stable, ever-increasing benefit.

The republic's party organization has worked out such areas. But the question is how we should move in these areas, and what acquisitions and losses we will incur. To a certain degree, the answers are being provided by our seminar also.

I would like to support the idea that was clearly expressed both in the reports and in the statements that were made, the idea of the need for the closer combining of production with science, and of science with production. This is not the first time we have mentioned this, but the situation has been moving ahead extremely slowly. Speaking at the party conference, I cited this fact. Last year the share of expenditures for science that services the republic's national economy constituted, in the republic's gross social product, only 0.53 percent. This is from one-fourth to one-third less than in England, Sweden, Japan, and the United States.

Then, ask yourself the question: is it possible, with this approach, to raise the technical level and quality of output?

Or to accelerate the creation of machines and machinery that makes it possible to achieve a major increase in labor productivity?

Or to develop the latest technological schemes that would reduce the material and labor expenditures for the production of a unit of output?

The answer is the same one: scarcely!

A situation of special concern is the situation with the creation of highly-effective technological schemes. In this regard, the scientific subdivisions of the agroindustrial complex have been lagging behind the world level, as I also mentioned at the conference. But this is doubly justified with respect to the scientific institutions in our republic.

Saying that they owe a debt to the workers in the fields and on the animal farms, and to the workers of the processing enterprises, means consciously simplifying the problem. Certain scientific institutions and their cadres, which have been called upon to promote, by means of their elaborations, the upsurge in agriculture and the changeover of agriculture to intensive technological schemes, have become so accustomed to that debt that they perceive it as something completely obvious.

Today life demands of us not only the payment of debts, but also a fundamental re-examination of the attitude to the job at hand, and also demands that scientists be aimed at large-scale achievements not only in the sphere of scientific research, but also in the sphere of the introduction of the results of that research into practice.

A good example of this is provided by the collective at the Grodno Oblast Scientific-Production Association. Its fields, we have been convinced, have become a real testing ground for developing and checking new technological schemes, for testing new varieties of agricultural crops, and for providing the kolkhozes and sovkhoses with top-quality seed material.

Work that is deserving of a high evaluation is the initiatory, purposeful work performed by the association's scientists and specialists in introducing the meristem method of obtaining potato seeds. This is truly a revolution in potato seed production, a revolution that opens up vast vistas for increasing the effectiveness of potato growing.

However, this attitude to the job at hand has not yet become the rule for most of the scientific institutions specializing in agriculture.

You might recall the sharpness with which the question of introducing intensive technological schemes into fodder production was raised at the meeting of the *aktiv* in Brest. In the combined-fodder industry, for example, the technological schemes are 30 years old. As a result, the effectiveness of fodder grain is from one-fourth to one-third the effectiveness in many foreign countries.

How, then, does one change the situation here? I think that you will agree that a reduction, over a two-year period, of the expenditure of fodders per unit of animal-husbandry output within the confines of 8-13 percent should not evoke a sense of satisfaction.

There is no name other than poor business practices that can be applied to the fact that a large percentage of grain continues to be used as fodder in unprocessed form, and protein-vitamin additives are issued by Gosagromprom agencies like ordinary combined fodders.

Or take such a question as the rise in the proficiency level of the cadres, because many people today confuse the family contract with the lease contract, and the lease contract with the collective contract, and do not possess all the components for cost accountability and self-financing.

One may be permitted to ask: are the administrators of the agroindustrial complex really incapable of providing a clear-cut knowledge of these problems to everyone who needs that knowledge?

Comrades! The CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo are concerned about the extremely strained situation that is developing in vegetable husbandry in a number of regions in our country. As a result of the worsening of the weather conditions, the plantings of grain and fodder crops have been substantially damaged.

The CPSU Central Committee deems it necessary for every party organization to make profound political conclusions from the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and to take practical steps to assure the continuous supplying of food products to the cities and to rural localities.

It is necessary first of all to assure the prompt and efficient bringing in of the harvest that has been grown and to dispose of it intelligently.

The procurement of sufficient quantities of high-grade fodders for socialized animal husbandry and for the citizen's personal plots is taking on special importance.

The party organizations and all the cadres in the agroindustrial complex must concentrate the efforts of rural workers in this area, and must overcome the lag that has been allowed to occur here. It is necessary to appeal to Communists and to the population in the cities, industrial centers, and villages to take direct part in procuring the fodders and bringing in the harvest, and to send additional material-technical resources to the rural areas.

The interests of the job at hand convince us of the need to prolong for the current year the procedure that has existed until now for preserving the wages on the basis of the place of basic work for workers from other branches of the national economy who have taken part in harvesting operations. It will be necessary in this regard to carry out the appropriate explanatory work in the collectives for rendering all kinds of assistance to the rural areas.

The chief gauge in evaluating the organizing capabilities and political maturity of the cadres and their contribution to perestroika must be the real improvement, as early as the current year, in providing the population with high-grade foodstuffs.

Obviously, the party committees should not dictate the tactics for conducting the harvesting operations, or give recommendations concerning technological schemes. All this is the job of the specific administrators and specialists on the spot.

The requirement of the day for the party committees and economic cadres is to guarantee the training of the people who will carry out the harvesting: the combine operators, truck drivers, machinists, and workers at the mechanized threshing floors and warehouses.

It is necessary to orient them toward highly productive labor, toward the readiness to work under complicated weather conditions, and toward high conscientiousness and discipline.

Questions of creating good working and recreational conditions must be in the center of attention.

We began perestroika with an awareness of the simple fact: we cannot continue to live the way we used to.

And whereas the April 1985 Plenum of the Central Committee and the party's 27th Congress have laid, figuratively speaking, the foundation for the rebuilding of the house that we share in common, then the decisions of the 19th Party Congress will make it possible to erect the various floors in that house.

For four days there have been sharp, complicated discussions in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. They have resulted in the enactment of extended resolutions. And when decisions have been made, it is necessary to make the transition from pluralism of opinions to the unity of actions.

Everything that has been planned must definitely be implemented. Please allow me to wish you success in this regard.

5075

**'SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA' Announces
Changes in Staff, Policy**
*18000517a Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in
Russian 28 Jun 88p 3*

[Article: "Everyone Starts with Himself: From the Meeting of the Editorial Board of SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA"]

[Text] A new editor has been appointed for our paper.¹ He is not assuming this post during easy times, but they are uncommonly interesting times, times calling for true creativity. Currently each and every Soviet citizen is imbued with the spirit of the XIXth All-Union CPSU Conference, and each one is least of all concerned with what we have managed to accomplish. Instead our thoughts are focussed on what we have not managed to accomplish, on what is hindering our progress and perestroika.

The staff of SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA shares the concerns of the party and the people. This is why the meeting of the editorial board held after confirmation of our new editor was devoted to a rigorous analysis of the reasons for our readers' disenchantment and to a search for ways to restore our lost position.

In particular, it was noted that the transfer of workers from one patronage position to another, as occurred in the past, inevitably leads to disorder. To truly improve matters, a leader is required who not only has impressive credentials, but, first and foremost, one who is a professional, who personally sets the tone in his dealings with his subordinates, who attracts people with his original views and extraordinary aspirations. This idea became a kind of refrain; yet when they spoke at the meeting, the participants were emphatically not thinking of the past, but of the future. When they spoke of the inauspicious structuring of the creative process, they were also trying to influence the plans of their new leader (as if to say, here is something we want you to remember).

The discussion was straightforward, without innuendo; after all, each understood that without this, there would be no break-through in our work. The newly appointed editor, himself, set the tone. Before the meeting of the editorial board, a kind of questionnaire was distributed to the staff, in which a number of questions were asked: How would you evaluate the popularity of the paper? What would you do to increase the prestige of the press? What would you like to see the new editor do?

By inviting the staff to discuss a sore point and appealing to their feelings of responsibility for the paper's reputation, the new leader "drew their fire." As a journalist, who had considerable experience working in the press, he wanted to exchange opinions on an equal footing and, it appeared, was pleased at how things turned out; although accomplishing what was desired of him would be far, far from easy.

The first desire was that the new editor act in accordance with principle and rationality in his dealings with the "higher ups," boldly defending positions dictated by the spirit of democratization, learning to see the difference between the party committee itself and its functionaries, and often insisting on his right to be in charge of the paper. Spinelessness on the part of the editor results in the majority of newspaper columns being devoted to ponderous material of no interest to the reader. It is of no less importance to resist the current custom for papers to rush to interpret political actions which are of fundamental importance to the party committee. Interpretation of important actions in the same issue that they are reported is inappropriate. Journalists must be given time to develop a deep understanding of a phenomenon, to find a nonclashed form for their piece, and to polish their language. And remember that haste, as a rule, engenders a negative result, so that the measures devised and taken by the party committee seem on the pages of the newspaper to be much less significant than they actually are.

There is another reason for this haste, which, in essence, is no good to anyone. This is failure to master the techniques for forecasting events. The editor has a special role here, since he has access to contacts at the highest levels and thus is able to guide the search with an eye toward both the immediate and the far future. Such an approach saves the journalists from exhausting routine and allows them to concentrate on topics which enrich the party committee by providing an original view of the process of social renewal and never fail to bring a genuine response from the reader.

The courage and high principles of an editor must manifest themselves in stemming the flow of so-called literary material which ATEM is frequently compelled to write under pressure from a variety of official offices. The reader's opinion must be the prime consideration. Experience has long since shown that a newspaper which is filled up with such publicity pieces remains in the "Soyuzpechat" kiosk. In the end, no one wants to subscribe to it.

The editorial staff and the readers of a paper are far from objecting to official, party, state, and government material—indeed, everyone reads it. But, after all, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that when you read one after another, let's say, a piece about a meeting of the Central Committee Buro, and then five or six pieces about meetings and conferences at the sector level, then the main point gets lost and the inexperienced reader perceives them all as being of equal significance. Moreover, it should be noted that reports about measures which are far from being of first-order importance frequently occupy more space than those which are really important—heaven forbid they should omit a list of who spoke and who was present.

There was a period when the paper SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA seemed to have won the hearts of its readers. Its pages carried extensive material on the

campaign then being conducted in our republic to combat reporting of inflated figures, falsifying reports, and other negative phenomena. During that time, the paper acquired more than 10,000 new readers. Now we are in a slump and there is only one way to put an end to it—we must act as our readers have so insistently exhorted us. They want the paper to trenchantly pose the questions which are now stirring up our community. Take, for example, problems of ecology. There has been no shortage of material in our paper calling for conservationist treatment of the earth, forests, rivers, and air, for efficient use of fertilizer and pesticides. In the editorial board, we have openly discussed how the newspaper has not gained supporters this way. On the contrary, a number of articles gave rise to angry letters. This, by no means, occurred because all the articles contained erroneous interpretations. They generally espoused legitimate views. But they did this listlessly, and the paper did not succeed in portraying a clear, generally comprehensible position. The lines published with the journalists' blessing did not cause the readers to feel pain over the state of the environment.

Recently, the newspaper has been increasingly giving its readers cause for forming an unflattering opinion about the crusading qualities of its journalists. It seems as if our editors have grown accustomed to a peaceful life and sometimes fail to note even things which simply must be noted. In particular this describes the paper's attitude to the much-talked-about meeting of representatives of the creative intelligentsia. Our paper's only response to this meeting was to publish letters from indignant readers. As for the journalists present at the meeting, they considered it a virtue not to participate in the polemic. In other words, they decided to be silent. Of course, we are not implying that someone-or-other always has to be exposed. Rather we are talking about the need to report what has occurred in a timely fashion, investigate it without prejudice, note the positive and, as they say, separate the wheat from the chaff.

The new editor and his closest comrades-in-arms, the editorial staff, must train their journalists never to shun critical problems, courageously to invade an area which is arousing passions, and manfully to defend every step taken on the road to perestroika.

That's right, and his closest comrades-in-arms... Without daily support from the editorial board, the director, be he as wise as Solomon, will accomplish little. The new director, expressing thanks for the advice and good wishes, briefly outlined his new program. And the first point in it was the concept of the editorial board as a body which is constantly in session, generating and

implementing new ideas and critical plans, responsible for bringing about the break-through in our work which cannot be put off, for raising the level of journalistic craftsmanship, and finally for restoring the allegiance of our readers. The second point states that the paper does not want material addressed to a small circle of people. Forms and literary devices must be found and problems must be presented in such a light that the publication captures the attention of the most heterogeneous portions of the population. Here we must not abuse the trust of the readers, wasting their time on pieces which are long on words and short on substance.

A special point of the program was devoted to the approach to letters from workers and to work with consultant authors. The essence of this point is that it will now be possible for all who wish to do so to express themselves, without correspondence in any way being sorted into categories of "for publication" and "not for publication" (as was done during the years of stagnation), and that the paper will publish material written by uncommon thinkers among party and Soviet workers, innovative workers in the economy, famous scholars, and a broad range of members of the creative intelligentsia. Close contacts with expert authors will help the editors not only to take clear steps against everything that interferes with restructuring, but also to concentrate their attention on positive expertise obtained since April of 1985.

Many other ideas have been proposed; we hope that our readers will note that they are being put into practice as early as the next few issues of the paper. We also hope that our friends will understand our intentions, evaluate our successes, and call our attention to our errors, thus helping us realize our aspirations.

Footnote.

1. Viktor Mikhaylovich Lebedkin, 51. Russian. Profession—journalist. Graduated from Kiev State University with honors, and from the Academy of Social Sciences of the CC CPSU. He began his career as a metal worker, then headed the Komsomol organization for construction of the Moldavian State Regional Power Station. For more than 10 years he worked in the youth press, editing the journal TRIBUN, and serving as deputy editor of the paper SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA. For the past 18 years he has been a member of the CC of the Moldavian Communist Party. He is the author of two novellas and several books of essays. He is married and has two children.

Return to Principles of 1918 RSFSR Constitution Advocated

18000542 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Jul 88 p 2

[Article by B. Topornin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "The Constitution Born of October"]

[Text] Seventy years ago, on 10 July 1918, the 5th All-Russian Congress of the Soviets approved the RSFSR Constitution. It consolidated the gains of October and established the basis of our social system.

It was adopted only eight months after the victory of the proletarian revolution. As one of its founders, V.I. Lenin was attempting to utilize in every possible way the new socialist law, which had come to replace the old bourgeois law.

Authority and respect for the Constitution were introduced in our country, which did not yet have traditions of this kind. After the 1906 re-examination of the Fundamental State Laws, tsarist Russia was, in Lenin's expression, a constitutional autocracy, absolutism "trimmed" with parliamentary forms. Although the country had something similar to a parliament—the Duma—and there was a State Council which functioned, in fact, the monarch's sovereignty was hardly limited at all.

After the February revolution, Russia was declared a republic. However, the Provisional Government for the most part kept the previously existing laws and institutions, postponing their re-examination and renewal until the calling of a Constitutional Assembly. The Fundamental Laws of 1906 were considered to have lost their force, but the legal acts which flowed from them were still in effect. And only October 1917 marked a sharp turn in the constitutional history of our country.

"We know," Lenin noted, that this Soviet constitution, which was approved in July, was not thought up by any commission, it was not composed by lawyers, and it was not copied from other constitutions. The world has never seen another constitution like ours."

The development of the Fundamental Law took place in an atmosphere of sharp disputes involving the comparison of differing versions which were frequently mutually exclusive. Bolsheviks, as well as representatives of the leftist SR's (Socialist Revolutionaries), the maximalists and other parties, took part in the work.

In this process the creators of the Constitution looked to the experience acquired during the revolutionary transformation of the first months of Soviet power and to the already available legal sources. Many questions concerning the social structure and state system of Soviet Russia were resolved in the course of the very first acts adopted by the proletarian authority. The creation of the Soviet

state, for example, was legally established in the Appeal of the 2d All-Russian Congress of the Soviets to "The Workers, Soldiers and Peasants." At that same congress the central organs of power and government were formed—the All-Russian Central Executive Committee (ACEC) and the Council of People's Commissars (CPC)—and in this way the formation of the new state apparatus was begun. The Congress adopted decrees about peace and land. In practice it became the highest constituent organ for all of Soviet Russia.

The acts adopted by the ACEC following the 2d Congress of the Soviets were of great significance. They included the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, decrees on the eight-hour work day, on the right to recall deputies and on the destruction of the system of estates and civilian ranks, etc. The Declaration of the Rights of the Working and the Exploited People, which was adopted by the 3d All-Russian Congress of the Soviets in January 1918, had fundamental significance. It defined the form of the state: a Republic of the Soviets. At Lenin's suggestion the Declaration of the Rights of the Working and the Exploited People was included in its entirety as the first section of the 1918 RSFSR Constitution.

The Constitution was not adopted for the sake of declaring good but abstract principles; from the very beginning it was viewed as a most important factor in the introduction of socialism and was intended for daily utilization in practical work. The 5th All-Russian Congress of the Soviets specifically assigned the people's commissariat an educational function: "to carry out in all schools and educational institutions—with no exceptions—of the Russian Republic the study of the main provisions of the present Constitution, and equally to explain and interpret them." Literature on the Fundamental Law of the Country began to appear. It was necessary to make every working person fully aware of the truly profound ideas built into the Constitution.

Today it is especially easy to see the gap between the declarations and the experience of the recent past, that is, the direct departure from the constitutional norms. But this is not the only problem; there is also the fact that in itself the constitutional text was frequently inaccurate or inadequate. The 1977 constitution declared the future transition to societal self-government under communism but not a single word was devoted to self-government under socialism. The clauses on cooperation and individual labor activity were obviously scanty. The clauses on the sovereignty of the soviets were not properly disclosed, nor were the ones on increasing the role of social organizations and labor collectives, as well as the role of the mechanism for the realization of rights, freedoms and obligations of citizens.

Although an understanding of the Constitution as a directly operating act predominated in theory; in fact it was tightly wrapped up in a multitude of other acts, and

the essential point is that they were not laws or government decrees, but departmental instructions. Contrary to the logic of the law, it was not the Constitution but instructions which became the arbiter of human destinies and social procedures.

During the preparation of the 1977 Constitution much was said about how it must be the Fundamental Law not only of the state but also of the entire society. In fact, however, there was unrestrained expansion in the sphere of state regulation, and opportunities for social initiative and individual activity were consciously limited. The Soviet Union as a whole was viewed primarily as a state which willingly or not was elevated above society and acquired the nature of an independent command force.

"...the people, united by the Soviets—that is who must direct the state," was V.I. Lenin's starting position during the formulation of that first constitution. A characteristic feature of the constitutional provisions of that time was a broad independence for local power while the resolution of key questions in the development of the entire society was concentrated at the center.

Today these principles are being revived. This is particularly noticeable in the recommendations of the 19th party conference, which were aimed at the renewal of the country's political system. The essence of this renewal is close in spirit to the first Constitution of the Country of the Soviets.

The 1918 RSFSR Constitution approved a fundamentally new type of relations between the state and the citizen, which were distinguished above all by the fact that rights and freedoms were not only declared but also guaranteed. It goes without saying that the concrete historical situation of that time predetermined the range of rights and freedoms which were formulated. The country could not, for example, provide work for all; the resources were meager and needed to provide for other socialist rights. However, even in the difficult conditions of the beginning stage, the 1918 RSFSR Constitution created the conditions for developing the societal participation level of the individual, for unleashing his or her potential, and for actively including the person in the processes of societal transformations.

The world's first socialist constitution reflected in full measure the creative revolutionary work of the masses, who asserted their sovereignty, and the ideals of humanism and social justice. And today the spirit and essence of the first Soviet Constitution serve as a remarkable example of a bold break-through in the theory and practice of social transformations, new discoveries and social knowledge.

**Pro-Stalin Critic of 'Children of the Arbat'
Rapped**

18000488 Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 20
14-21 May 88 pp 14-16

[Article by Stanislav Rassadin: "To Divide Everything?" under the "Polemical Notes" rubric; first five paragraphs are an italicized epigraph from Mikhail Bulgakov's "The Heart of a Dog"]

[Text] "I don't agree, I'm telling you."

"With whom? With Engels or Kautsky?"

"With both of them," replied Sharikov.

"This is great, I swear to God. And what do you propose?"

"What do I propose? They write on and on. My head is swelling from it. Everything should just be divided."

In the early 1960s, when I was still young and did not think it dangerous yet to play with predators' cubs in the young animals section at the zoo—because they were young, even though they already had fangs—I had a talk with a beginning poet. Let us call him K.

"In Russia, there are currently only two true poets!"

That was what he told me. Since his opinion of his own work was even better known than his incipient temper (oh, how greatly that temper of his has since developed!) and since he was also reputed to be a diligent imitator of Boris Slutskiy, it seemed safe to reply:

"I see. The first one, naturally, is you. And who is the other one? Slutskiy?"

"No. Slutskiy is rubbish. Me and P." Then he corrected himself: "Well, in truth, there are not two but three poets. There is also Akhmatova."

At the time, I just shrugged. But now I see that it was a good idea, even though to associate Anna Adreyevna with the group had not been a calculated decision on his part but was motivated by his animal desire to assert himself. It was, you see, simple division. Yes, indeed, division. Akhmatova plus our K. and P., if divided by three would amount to something significant. As the saying goes, a horse is equal to a pheasant.

Could the prophet Bulgakov foresee that the idea of his unforgettable Sharikov would be appropriated by writers?

Nevertheless, it was.

In my article "Is Everything Permitted?" (OGONEK, No 13), to which the present one is essentially a sequel or even a second part, I quoted, with great amazement,

Anatoliy Lanshchikov: "In my opinion, both literary journals, NOVYY MIR as well as OKTYABR, played a role in the life of the society." Which means that both Tvardovskiy and Kochetov did. I must confess, I quoted that as an oddity; yet, it was a rash action on my part: I embellished harsh reality. See, for instance, a quote from Mikhail Sinelnikov, from LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, also No 13: "Indeed, NOVYY MIR, under A.Tvardovskiy's leadership...." There follows a praise that nowadays seems to have become obligatory: the journal, naturally, had some merit, no one denies it. "True, to apply administrative sanctions was a very grave mistake." The tale of the journal's suppression follows; it is not a very passionate tale, but what else could be expected of someone who took an active part in the persecution of NOVYY MIR? (Sinelnikov himself, however, uses softer terms: the meaning of Tvardovskiy's journal "was not always correctly understood by its opponents, by me among others." Here, I must ask this opponent not to be overly modest: why deny yourself your due, Mikhail Khanaanovich? It was all understood very well, by your class sense; it was understood quite correctly and that was the reason why the journal was being bashed—both by you yourself and by those with more power.)

That, however, was only the beginning, the start, the overture. Since "all this having been said...." (See for yourselves.) "All this having been said"—there follow some tired shallow assertions based on the same generalizing principle: how improperly cliquish NOVYY MIR was and how its writers were chosen not according to talent or, perhaps, honesty but to fame. The simple idea to ask the authors of the notorious "Letter of the Eleven," which buried, or at least attempted to bury NOVYY MIR, to publish their current opinion on the subject (especially those among them who swear by Tvardovskiy's name), this simple idea has elicited Sinelnikov's sarcastic wrath: "What, repentance today must take the form of a compulsory public event? Perhaps, under guard?..."

To be honest, I would not make rash jokes about repentance, if I were Sinelnikov. I think that if you, whoever you are, used to sing praises to Rashidov's novels, for instance, or Brezhnev's trilogy, if you were erasing the name Andropov, right after he died, in journal galleys inserting instead the name Chernenko—I know some people like this, we all do—but now you repeat democracy, perestroika, glasnost; would not you be troubled by uncomfortable memories? I am not naive enough to appeal to conscience, but I think you should be ashamed in front of other people. People do remember. At least, you should maintain appearances. Please, for appearances' sake, show that you have not forgotten either. This is not too much to ask.

Man is weak. Having finished Sinelnikov, I nearly exclaimed helplessly and pathetically: "It does not get any worse than this!" Unfortunately it does.

In the latest issue of NASH SOVREMENNİK, No 4, I read the following: "A lot has been written—both here and abroad—about Tvardovskiy's departure from NOVYY MIR. Yet, an influential French critic Robel wrote in LETTRES FRANCAIS (December 1970) that the most important event in the life of Soviet literature was not Tvardovskiy's departure from NOVYY MIR (which had by then exhausted itself, we should add), but A.B.Nikonov's departure from MOLODAYA GVAR-DIYA. Time has shown that those two events were indeed of unequal significance."

Yes. This was written by the critic Mikhail Lobanov, who under Nikonov was on MOLODAYA GVAR-DIYA's editorial board. After overcoming understandable stupor, one discovers here some food for thought.

Do you know another reason why division is so horrible? It is because it is false. Those who make use it and even try to pass it for historical objectivity do not want it for themselves. Even in "The Heart of a Dog," Sharikov, who suggests it, would not be satisfied with it and would grab everything for himself, if he had a chance. To be convinced, you need only to think of our recent history or re-read Hoffmann's "Little Zaches."

I was rash to get so angry at Lanshchikov who, against this background, looks touchingly tactful: he only put NOVYY MIR on the same level as OKTYABR—that was all, fifty-fifty, equality-fraternity. I was gullible enough to think that a formal, unenthusiastic acknowledgement of some merit of Tvardovskiy and his journal has become obligatory. But no. This time NOVYY MIR was not so lucky, and Nikonov and his MOLODAYA GVARDIYA were not just placed on the same level as Tvardovskiy but, even worse, triumphantly contrasted with him; national pride was cast aside in the process, the primacy of things Soviet neglected and the authority of some foreigner humbly appealed to. (This is usual business, chauvinism coexisting with servility; similarly, Lobanov's proud self-assessment as a repository of popular spirit coexists with a rather peculiar idea of his native tongue: for instance, he mentions "finding a scapegoat in the person of the author." A goat in the person, what a creature.)

Here we no longer have simple division but a redrawing of boundaries, a reshaping. It is no longer equalization but an aggression; an aggression against history, no less.

Lobanov diligently quotes from Yuriy Trifonov's memoirs about Tvardovskiy and his characterization of the campaign against NOVYY MIR and the "Letter of the Eleven" as a "nasty little article," a "repulsive campaign of defamation and harassment" and a "deliberate and typical insult." Then, he provides his emotional commentary: "Note the great commotion, the great noise that was started by just one letter in support of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA." Do you get it? A letter in support. Just one. One could fairly cry before this picture of the 11 knights of justice and good, those 11 Don Quixotes

defending the oppressed, humiliated MOLODAYA GVARDIYA that was harassed by the evil NOVYY MIR; they acted together and yet as though each on his own, (note "just one letter," the voice crying in the desert) and what was their reward for their lonely quest? Nothing but noise and commotion.

Yes, one could cry but one somehow does not. Perhaps, it is because one remembers the fate of both NOVYY MIR and its murdered—or finished up—editor.

On the other hand:

"Objectively, it came to be that NOVYY MIR, especially its literary criticism which set tone of the journal, outlived its purpose and exhausted its liberal progressivist pretensions (having aimed its arrows, as many other publications did, against MOLODAYA GVARDIYA and its 'traditions and populism')." The idea is that the bureaucracy that destroyed Tvardovskiy's journal and tragically broke his life did, in fact, a good deed. Moreover, it acted as an agent of Providence, having justly and painlessly eliminated what had already outlived its purpose. Especially since "Tvardovskiy himself was already gravely ill... and could not supervise the work of the journal."

What an amazing coincidence; great good luck, no less.

Let us restrain ourselves. Let us not lower ourselves to trying to refute this. Let us just ask: could a human write this—or a cannibal?

There is a category of writing that should not be argued with. It is enough to show the reader the goods themselves. Sometimes the goods are rather frightening and sometimes funny, but in such cases a subject for discussion does not exist: those works do not come with it. For instance this: "Time has shown... Objectively, it so happened... In short, harassment of Tvardovskiy is nothing but the fruit of a biased imagination." This is all. Period. Can you argue with this? I do not think so. One can argue with someone who is poorly informed or in error; it is pointless and senseless to argue with those who knowingly and deliberately look you straight in the eye and tell a lie. I am not going to argue, neither in this frightening case nor in the more ridiculous one (I am referring to Sinelnikov's article.)

In the latter, several critics are sternly reproached. They are Nataliya Ilina, Tatyana Ivanova, Burtin, Sarnov, and me, too, I am included into this flattering group. My article "Is Everything Permitted?" even warranted a postscript of sorts. I should not only refrain from arguing but be grateful both for the select company in which I was included and for the fact that the author perused my article attentively and recounted it diligently, omitting—my sincere thanks go out to him—neither key thoughts nor key words. For instance, he reminded readers of my views on the writings of Tatyana Glushkova and on the

forces that drive her. ("The exigency of the struggle for survival"—yes, this is correct.) In short, it was a diligently, almost scrupulously prepared summary.

But, to be fair, Sinelnikov did catch me out in one thing. I wrote that keeping books by Platonov, Akhmatova, Gumilev and others from us was like depriving us of air and forcing us to live in a gas mask. If so, he asked sarcastically, how did Rassadin manage to write his two dozen books? Well, nothing to do here but confess. Yes, I am guilty. In search of the air that I was lacking I had to turn to Pushkin, Fonvizin, Denis Davydov, Delvig, Vyazemskiy; it can not be denied that I had to flee, to escape while my accuser breathed with full lungs and if at times a sentiment did take his breath away, that sentiment was probably admiration: "Great emotional force... An event in the spiritual life of the people... Profound attention and respect for the working man... Deep humanist meaning..." Did you guess what it is about? Yes, those books: "Lesser Territory," "Virgin Land" and "Rebirth"—what other subjects were worth devoting one's muse to? Sinelnikov the Freedom-Loving and the Intrepid used to sing praises to Brezhnev's trilogy and, fearing nothing, exalt Chakovskiy, Kozhevnikov, Proskurin, Anatoliy Ivanov and Mikhail Alekseyev while attacking... Should I remind you what he used to attack? What is the use? I am not asking him to acknowledge guilt. I am not a utopian. But even in that LITERATURNAYA GAZETA article of his, someone else is attacked, besides the above-mentioned recalcitrant critics. That someone else is Andrey Platonov, and he is criticized not for something insignificant, but for the main metaphor of "The Furnace", for the very purpose of that great book. "I can not accept..." (That is, Sinelnikov can not accept Platonov); do you see the parallel? He can neither accept nor be silent about it—not for anything in the world, come what may. He is strong as flint, rigorous as a tree trunk.

This is the reason why I have asked what there is to argue with, which one of Sinelnikov's ideas.

What do you think he immediately pounced on after reading my article? The following: "The issue (of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, the one with Glushkova's article) came out on March 23. Yet, the issue of the magazine (with my response), as indicated, was signed to press on March 22..." Do you see the horrible insinuation?

One is tempted to built on this an impressive scene. A dark night. Critic Rassadin, armed with a burglary tool, rolls heavily over the window ledge on one of the top floors of the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA building; lighting his way with a flashlight, he finds the top-secret strong box where, hidden from the public, manuscripts are kept and turns the dial of the number lock with his safe cracker-sensitive fingers. And not to forget OGO-NEK's entire editorial board, led by Korotich, which is in the courtyard, uneasily, on the lookout.

But, so as not to catch the spy-seeing disease, let us think of something simpler. Let us start with the idea that LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, No 13, did not come out on March 23 but on March 22; it always comes out a day earlier, on Tuesdays, which is precisely when it is distributed to employees, is sent to the supervisory agencies and even gets to subscribers; it was signed to press actually ("as indicated") on March 21. As to Rassadin's article, it appeared the so-called operative pages, which the editorial board is free to set and reset even after the issue is signed. How much time do we now get to write the article? Still too little? Fine, let us continue with our scenario. Some writers, I am sorry to say, could be able to write fast, especially in emergencies. Also, the article could have been conceived and written during a long time period and could have already contained some things. Yes, indeed, it contained a lot of things, it was lacking only the final brush stroke, so that when Glushkova's article appeared the task of completing the article would not have seemed impossible even to Sinelnikov. Still hard to believe? Unfortunately, I understand this only too well. It is hard to believe because professionalism only invites accusations of criminal misconduct and because it takes even longer, much longer, to print an article than to write it. Glushkova's scandalous piece was being readied for publication so painfully slowly that I had known weeks in advance what she criticized and demanded, from people infinitely far removed from LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, and those who respect the weekly—primarily for its second section—were sorry and amazed to see it suddenly fall so low. Morally at least, I was prepared for the appearance of Glushkova's monster.

Still, one must respect one's opponent. It is a measure of my respect for Mikhail Sinelnikov that I absolutely refuse to believe that he is so slow on the uptake—no matter how hard he would try to convince me. In the past, he was very quick to bash Aleksandr Trifonovich Tvardovskiy's journal and knew very well what he was saying when he, as part of an admiring crowd, was savoring the "great emotional force" of the books signed by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, and he has not lost his acumen yet. Ability to dispense with literary arguments—except by imitating them, albeit half-heartedly—is, believe me, a skill, a school, even an art form of sorts; as in any other art, some practitioners openly reject it (Lobanov, for instance, blissfully distorts the truth without the help of tricks or inventions) and some are zealous but not overly skillful students (Sinelnikov, I think, is one of those); the art also has its true masters, even virtuosos.

Now, driven by a kind of reverential curiosity, I turn my attention to the work of one such master.

"I will focus on Anatoliy Rybakov's novel 'Children of the Arbat,' warns Vadim Kozhinov at the start (in the same issue of NASH SOVREMENNİK, No 4). "Why?" he asks himself and then replies: because, among other things, "A. Rybakov's work received the greatest acclaim and the most favorable reviews."

The answer, I must give it its due, is honest. So much so that a compassionate and scary thought comes to mind: if "Children of the Arbat" had not been, at long last, published, what would then—since it is not the first time—critic Kozhinov would have focused on, since, if I am correct, no other book irritates him as much as this novel? (I can vividly imagine him looking around, digging and searching feverishly everywhere for something even worse, and not being able to find it.) Yet, there is no reason to fear: led by his unerring anti-taste, he would have found something in the end, just as he has recently chosen for a methodical bashing not the prose of Pikul or Anatoliy Ivanov (which is also very famous), but that of Yuriy Trifonov. Just as he never lets an opportunity slide to kick or stab Tynyanov, Tendryakov, Kaverin, Granin, Baklanov or Arseniy Tarkovskiy. It all adds up to a decent, even enviable collection of books, and if the names of some of our better writers are missing from it I can bet that none of those who are the shame of our letters can be found in this series. Maybe one or two, but even that is unlikely.

Now the honor of being put on that golden bookshelf, like on a scaffold, has befallen Rybakov.

So the question why is more or less answered. But what for? What is his aim? What are his means?

Let us start with the means:

"Is it true that Lenin wrote that Stalin was rude and disloyal?"

"How do you know?"

"What is the difference? I just know."

This is, as you recall, from "Children of the Arbat." Sasha Pankratov asks his uncle Mark Ryazanov; and now listen to the heavy load of reprimand dumped on those three simple lines (it is a great load, but you must be patient: I have said that I must show you the goods):

"Ryazanov's surprise ('How do you know?') makes no sense at all since such high-level official had to know that six years before his conversation with Sasha, on November 2, 1927, PRAVDA had printed Stalin's speech, which was later repeatedly reprinted in mass quantities, where Stalin declared, in particular:

"They say that in...his 'testament' comrade Lenin asked the congress, in view of Stalin's 'rudeness', to consider replacing Stalin as a General Secretary by someone else. This is absolutely true."

"If Sasha had asked the same question prior to November 1927 it would have been understandable. But the fact that he is asking it in 1933 only shows his ignorance and

lack of knowledge of very important political documents; as to Ryazanov's surprise, since he is soon to become a member of the Central Committee, it is simply absurd."

One could lazily start objecting. Lazily because the task calls for no particular effort. One could say, for instance, that 6 years before that young Sasha was a mere child, whose tender age should probably be spared and he should not be accused, as though in a court-marshal, of political ignorance. Or that by 1933 Stalin's half-hearted confession was no longer emphasized and that for taking Lenin's testament in vain one could pay dearly. In fact, Stalin's confession was not just half-hearted but outright false; having said absolutely true, Stalin then insidiously declared that the "rudeness"—in quotation marks, I want you to note—was directed against the enemy, so that Lenin's words were not only doctored but somehow refuted.

Finally, one could even say that to view a novel as a history textbook is strange: such test no one would pass, neither Lev Tolstoy nor Petr Proskurin. One could say that but one should not. The tactic is not opportunistic or primitive but sly, to say the least. Indeed, is Kozhinov trying to learn history from Rybakov but is thwarted? Come on. He wants to teach himself, since he knows in advance how a writer should write and what a writer should say.

In short, it is a by-now-familiar situation: it makes no sense to argue. It would suffice to reach for the bookshelf, take "Children of the Arbat," open it on page 13 and see that the quote is falsified. Because it is followed by this:

"Those are strictly personal qualities," said Mark, "and they aren't important. The political line is what's important."

Here we go. Ryazanov, as it turns out, knows and remembers everything very well, but does not like the fact that his nephew knows it, too. What remains, then, of the accusations that the character makes no sense or is absurd, and that Rybakov is historically inaccurate?

Do not rush to say nothing. Something does remain.

The critic Sergey Chuprinin once did several sketches of his colleagues. Some, like Kozhinov's, are brilliant. Among Kozhanov's techniques he noted a very characteristic one: "when addressing a mass audience, the proof is easily replaced by the intensity of tone, finality of judgement and, most importantly, systematic destruction of some literary reputations and promotion of others." Or, to use a shorter version: "repetition and hammering at a previously prepared idea."

Let us remember hammering and look at the previously prepared idea.

To deprive us of the time needed to reach for the bookshelf if we have a doubt, he gives us no respite. Rybakov quickly gets another "historical inaccuracy" rap: in his novel, Stalin thinks of himself as the author and organizer of the plan to rebuild Moscow—i.e. to destroy its ancient appearance, and he—Rybakov, not Stalin—is rebuked once again. How can this be if Iosif Vissarionovich himself bestowed that honor on Lazar Moiseyevich: "Our proven leader L.M.Kaganovich, the author (I have italicized this word, notes Kozhinov) of the new plan of architectural decoration of Moscow..."

Kozhinov may have indeed italicized that word, no one denies him his share of participation in Stalin's announcement, but whoever would want to object to him in other matters is once again stymied. It is almost tactless to object to this, for one risks insulting the critic. If one voices an objection, one must assume that Vadim Kozhinov does not know the basics and can not understand Stalin's perfidy or the craftiness of a tyrant who knows that it is safer to maintain autocratic rule if one rules by sharing honors like a daily allowance; a measure of Stalin's craftiness and perfidy was the fact that alongside him, the genius of all times and all peoples, there were toy titles such as First Marshal, Iron Narkom or, for example, Author of the Plan for Reconstruction of the Capital. Had that been otherwise, would Lebedev-Kumach or Dzhambul have dared to sing personal—and extremely immoderate—praises to Voroshilov or Yezhov? As to Pyatnitskiy's Choir, it would have certainly shared the common fate of those who were indicted for group conspiracy against Stalin for their greeting song for Molotov (of which I still remember from my childhood the straining "Our Vyacheslav Mikhaylovich").

But there is no sense in arguing, and no time to argue either. Having quickly wound up the discussion about Kaganovich to whom our democratically inclined leader had given up his place of honor—his own, mind—Kozhinov suddenly seems to have been satiated with his own iron-clad logic puts it aside, fatigued: "But we hardly need to dwell on this point."

It is good enough. A suspicion is cast on the novel and nothing more is required—for the time being.

A sympathizer, of course, may get anxious for Kozhinov, that reckless soul: what if people re-read the novel, check the fact and catch him red-handed? There is nothing to worry about. It has happened before: he has been caught before and has lived through it.

Here is how it happened. In the journal DRUZHBA NARODOV No 1 Kozhinov declared: "A lot....has been said about the terrible role played by Lysenko in the destruction of biological science; yet D. Granin in "Bison" says that Lysenko was an obedient instrument in the hands of such theoreticians as Deborin and Present."

Everything would have gone off smoothly but for a naive person, OGONEK reader A.M.Blokh, deciding that there was a cause for argument: "It is disgustingly, painfully familiar written acrobatics, whereby by deliberately selecting a certain type of last names, everything is turned inside out. The premise leads to one natural conclusion: the true culprits in the tragedy of Soviet biology are the very same foreign elements, or as "Pamyat" terms them, the Satan's force."

And of course Blokh himself was asking for it, for his naivete. "Camouflaged as a fighter against chauvinism, Blokh in reality speaks like a man driven by a militantly nationalist, i.e., chauvinist, spirit," etc., etc: angered, Kozhinov dumped and poured a lot of stuff on the head of the reader who dared stick it out. He even had a melancholy thought: for people like Blokh, "the path to the truth is extremely hard." (Naturally it is extremely difficult, if he caught Kozhinov red-handed.) This time, Kozhinov mobilized under his banner not only the innocent Daniil Granin, but the innocent Anatoliy Golovkov, who had mentioned in OGONEK some Jewish last names of NKVD officers; using his technique of repetition and hammering, Kozhinov generously added a few flashy ones, from the ethnic point of view: Roshal, Pauker, Rappoport, Firin, Berman, Kogan, etc. In addition—for the sake of impartiality, of course—he noted that those henchmen of the evil Yagoda "were not 'Stalin's men'" Stalin, in other words, bears no responsibility for their actions. And not for Author Kaganovich's either, who himself is personally responsible.

See what our people are capable of doing. And citizen Blokh, he should know his own people, too.

In one thing Kozhinov was right reproaching A.M.Blokh. Blokh, "maliciously misleading the readers, dropped the reference to Granin." Malicious or not, but it was a mistake, because Blokh thus missed the opportunity to illustrate Kozhinov's "willful," as he himself terms it, attitude toward his sources. Blokh did not mention that Kozhinov accused Granin falsely: no matter how hard you search in "Bison," you will never find a place there where the author says anything even remotely similar to what the critic willfully claims. I think that Kozhinov himself searched the book extensively in the hope of hitting the insolent Blokh with something besides dirt—but alas, he did not find it. Let us console ourselves, however, by the hope that while searching it he found a few useful ideas.

This one, for instance: "Antisemitism was repulsive to Bison as to any true Russian intellectual."

Or this one: "Lysenkoism, or as it was called at the time the shaving of science, led to a situation whereby scientists falsified data, tampered with quotations and stole other people's ideas."

I would be intrigued to find the roots of this carefree sloppiness. Why isn't Kozhinov in the least concerned that it is so easy to catch him cheating: even casting aside lofty considerations (such as responsibility, duty and honor), one would think that amour propre alone would rebel against it. Had he wished—here is a sincere compliment—Kozhinov, with his experience, could have if not proved something that is impossible to prove, at least showed some ability to camouflage; he could have made pseudo-proof look more respectable and his inventions more difficult to uncover.

He simply did not want to do so; he did not need it. Moreover, reality, with which he must unavoidable come in contact from time to time, is an impediment to him. Simply because it is reality.

You do not understand how it may happen? Let us look into it.

His task, for instance, is to prove that Rybakov explains Stalin and stalinism as an exclusively Russian way which can be comprehended only through its Russianness. It is a difficult task since there is nothing like this in the novel. Kozhinov himself knows this, praised be his common sense, but just as economic managers who use the same willful style want to squeeze something out of nothing, so he, too, see nothing impossible in this task.

This is how he proceeds. "In a careful, indirect manner the novel seeks to implant the thought the Stalin is, so to speak, a peculiarly Russian phenomenon," declares Kozhinov and in the same paragraph, not begrudging space for a reiteration, notes: "This idea, I repeat, is not clearly or definitively stated in the novel.

Is he repeating himself because he is so conscientious? Hardly: he must implant, or hammer in, the thought into our consciousness. If even Rybakov himself is not clear and definitive on this point (which in itself may serve to rouse suspicion of some hidden purpose and saboteur's disguise, and warrant vigilance on our part), what could the critic do? He would have like very much to find strong proof; it is not his fault that he was not given an opportunity to do so.

Therefore, the critic uses the blank space between paragraphs as a Rubicon of sorts and starts the next paragraph not with some timorous pussyfooting but with a direct assertion: "Thus, Stalin chose the 'Russian' way instead of a 'European' one."

Thus. It has been done. The thought seems to have been firmly implanted in us, it has become a material force, and Peter the Great and Ivan the Terrible have been tossed in (his views on these figures—I can prove it if need be—smack either of historical inaccuracy or ignorance, I do not know which); in short, the force can not be stopped unless... Unfortunately, there is this unless. The sly Rybakov turns out to have created an impediment: his novel contains a scene that, damn it, not only

falls out of Kozhinov's triumphant construction but undermines it completely. It does it so soundly and so plainly that Kozhinov's throws up his hands in resignation: "It can not be denied that 'Children of the Arbat' contains a scene that would appear to refute the theory of the Russian origins of Stalin's terror."

What, to back down? To turn away from something "careful and indirect" that your predator's sense has helped you to uncover? Not in this life! The quick-thinking Kozhinov supposes—no, he knows it for a fact—that the author has injected this fictional scene—note, fictional, not force on him by historical fact—"willy-nilly." And, having unfortunately chosen not to elaborate on who exactly it was that so cruelly forced Rybakov to harm the hidden purpose of his work, Kozhinov concludes without hesitation: "This correct information irrefutably shows that Stalin had nothing to learn in Russia. The assertion of the Russian origin of Stalin's cruelty is therefore completely groundless."

Did you fully appreciate what you have just seen? Did you realize the singularity of it? The novel's real, true flesh—here it is before your eyes: you can read it, touch it, feel it—has just refuted something hazily unclear and nonexistent, something that has its origins in Kozhinov's imagination. The novel has refuted it by its very essence. Now what? Nothing. Kozhinov continues to believe in the nonexistent, in something that he can neither show us, nor prove its existence to us, nor name it—yet, he continues to insist on it and to hammer it into our heads.

Did I say believe? If so, I am retracting it.

At one time, Vadim Kozhinov rightly reproached the critics, meaning us, for standing on ceremony and never, or hardly ever, calling a mediocrity by its name. I recall that I secretly and shamefacedly agreed with him, for even though over the years I have taken to task a fair number of pretentious graphomaniacs and unskilled hacks, I have invariably refrained from using that sacred term. Why? Later, I decided that it has been due to its finality. No matter how hard one tried, one can never compensate for what one does not have; it would have been cruel to point up his deficiency to a person, even if that person profited greatly from it by becoming an innocuous—and therefore prosperous—hack.

In this case, however, the situation is not irreparable. It is a situation that the author could have—and therefore probably must have—avoided, and thus I can finally grant Kozhinov's wish and express myself directly. The image of his methods created by Sergey Chuprinin, translated from the oblique professional jargon into plain speech, should sound as follows: the system of precisely organized lies.

I would like to emphasize that it is a system. It was not invented by Kozhinov but, to repeat a compliment, he uses like a master.

And who else could use it so well, but one of us? We were told by the authorities at the highest level that, for instance, it would only take a short step or two to reach true communism while we, although we did not believe them—such simpletons probably do not exist, at least were willing to pretend to. And we did not get overly upset if our belief was taken by the authorities at its face value.

Or maybe it was not. They were no simpletons either. This is it, this is our great and continuing problem: we were obviously angry and upset by the very obvious discrepancy between the words about our achieved prosperity on the one hand and the state of our homes, stores, service and clothing on the other. We were angry and upset but not really insulted, because we were all convinced that that was how it was supposed to be: newspapers were supposed to lie, that was their purpose, and the authorities did not speak to us in any other language. These fictions naturally failed to convince us, but we accepted their inevitability and, as though underground, found salvation instead in humor, satire and political jokes. A kind of a general peaceful conspiracy existed: they lied to us, without expecting us in the least to believe the lies, at least not in their entirety, and we did not deceive the liars' expectations.

I am not trying to draw direct parallels since this is not a genetic diagnosis. Yet, the one thing I know is that whatever it is that Vadim Kozhinov's article represents (and I think that even for a maestro of his caliber it is a peak, a tour de force, a height of perfection), it could only exist in a climate that was thickening around us in those long years. Those years should never return, but they should not be forgotten either.

To the critic whom I am analyzing—I am doing this because I consider him a typical and important figure, a natural phenomenon—logic is not important, not even the false logic that exists for the sake of appearance. He may even get upset if by chance his argument turns out to be logical. Lack of proof as a principle is an integral part of the well-organized system of lies and it is, let us not belittle it, a rather potent weapon. We who are used to living in the system of word-clad ghosts are defenseless before the willful treatment of sources. This is a harmless example, as far as such things go: here Kozhinov has carelessly, with great contempt for us and for the author, imitated proof in his article on "Children of the Arbat" and feels that he has the right not to bother with any sort of proof while saying anything he want about the novel. He might declare that Rybakov imitates Alexander Dumas—and why not?—and that Stalin talking to Yezhov resemble Richlieu talking to Milady. Who, and what, could stop him the mirage- and ghost-filled world that Vadim Kozhinov so cozily inhabits?

Yet, do not think that mirages are completely harmless. "Keep lying, something may stick," says a French proverb. Recall what stuck and what came to the surface while Kozhinov was not overly diligently imitating

proof: something may have been hammered in. What image of the leader did you take away? Some perhaps saw Stalin (or rather, found support for their already existing image) as a leader whose demanding attitude toward himself was so well-known that even young Sasha must have been aware of it (and if he was not he is a political ignoramus), as a leader who gladly shared power and honors, with Kaganovich, for instance, and therefore was not really responsible for what was done to the country and the people during his rule.

You may say that I exaggerate and that this does not follow from the discussion of the question who was the author of the plan to destroy the old Moscow. I think that it does follow, and if you do not believe me, here is another example. The article mentions one Yakovlev-Epshtein, the Narkom of Land from 1929 to 1934, in the following context: "There could hardly be any doubt that this man bears the bulk of the responsibility for the tragedy of 1933." Oh, yes, and it is truly a great pity that Stalin was unable to reign in the obstreperous Epshtein and prevent the tragedy; he was trying very hard to do so and even wrote "The Headspin from Success," but he was unable. Perhaps he lacked enough power.

This is just like the story of the innocuous Lysenko who turned out to be a mere obedient (and therefore even more dangerous, right?) weapon in the hands of various Prezents and Deborins.

We could find a lot of other such things in Kozhinov's remarkable article. I may not even have found the most interesting ones. Therefore, do me a favor, get NASH SOVREMENNİK, No 4, and see for yourselves (I will assist you in your task by listing the most salient pages: 162-164, 165-168 and 171-173) how it can be plainly stated that Stalin's cult was created almost against his will, at least without his participation.¹ Who was responsible then? Well, go see for yourselves, and think if you wish that I am whetting your curiosity as an advertising ploy.

You will also read something extraordinary about 1937, too. First, you will learn that writers with an intellectual (a bad word in this context, as you may have expected) bend are excessively preoccupied with the unfortunate 1937 and are less interested in the losses of the preceding years. Since we are not told who those writers are, we can not argue with the author here either, but let us at least wonder what kind of bloody bookkeeping this is, why this cold clicking of a calculator over an enormous national and international tragedy. Are we back to dividing everything?

The coldness, incidentally, should be understood and duly appreciated. "To avoid misunderstanding I would like to point out," writes Kozhinov, and then lists members of his own family murdered by Stalin. "Yet, I

can not allow myself to single out in any way the fates of those who are close to me by blood or professionally (I mean writers and intelligentsia in general) in a general tragedy of the nation."

One has an urge to ask who are those who do allow it to themselves? Just name them. Here, once again, there can be no argument, but this is beside the point.

I bow my head in respect for the dead, but reading their cold relative's words I somehow feel that I prefer to them, polluted as they are by literary jargon and engaged in tactical games, simpler words written to us by our readers. Perhaps even these:

"...I could mention my father. In 1937 he was arrested by the rayon NKVD chief and never came home after that. I do not blame Stalin for his death because at the time it was the question of life and death for socialism..."

"...Today's perestroika needs people like Stalin. He punished severely transgressions and crimes in the society. And he was right. It served them right..."

One feels sadness, fear and shame while reading these lines. Why then do I prefer them? The reason is very simple. Those who were robbed by history, whose souls were crippled, can and should be pitied. One could feel compassion for them, but not for those who crippled them.

I do not want to end on a sour note. Let me try to write something upbeat.

"Criticism is an area of spiritual activity that more than others informs social consciousness." This was written by Svetlana Selivanova, a member of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's editorial board, who writes rarely and little but when she does she hits the nail on the head. This is the second article that I have ended with her quotation, and it may become a good tradition.

If indeed our criticism—or at least that which has passed for its mainstream during the past two decades directing and shaping it—had more than other areas influenced the consciousness of our society, the period of stagnation would have lasted longer than the Tartar-Mongolian Yoke. Nevertheless it ended, even though some people may not like it and even though it echoes painfully in us and makes attempts to return.

Footnotes

1. For those who were unable to find it and do not trust me, I quote: "Stalin's cult was not at all the result of intrigues by him or by some shady henchmen of his; it was, in the true sense of the word, a worldwide process, under way from Madrid to Shanghai."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," "Ogonek," 1988.

12892

Critic Scores Pro-Stalinist Writings in Literary Journals

18000466 Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 24,
11-18 Jun 88 pp 10-12

[Article by Tatyana Ivanova under the "What to Read" rubric: "Who is Risking What?"]

[Text] Of course universal unanimity of thought would be desirable; after all, if unanimity of thought were universal, Chairman Belokon—whose tragic story was told by Yuri Chernichenko in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA—would not have perished: find yourself a copy of the 3 May issue. And we have long since watched on our TV screens the film "An Impersonal Affair," by the young director Algis Arlauskas; whereas it was once advertised on a Central Television program, and the newspapers announced that it was forbidden to show it (Oh Glasnost, you were such a baby then!).

Dear God, forgive us, if you can. We would know the names of the Armenians who perished at the hands of the rioters during the tragic events which Genrikh Borovik recently related to us in his "Position" broadcast. We would send condolences to their families; we would express our sympathy to them; and perhaps we would have helped them, those who were able to...

What has befallen us? Why is this heavy air So confused and inconsolable? Why does the fog linger so above the grass? Someone has been crushed, Oppressed, Laid low. Someone's heart has burnt up, Or it is still smoldering In solitude and silence...

This is a poem by Maro Markaryan, translated by Vladimir Leonovich, from a selection of Armenian poems; and, I hope, not published in the April issue of NOVYY MIR by accident.

I urgently recommend you study this issue (We envy those who have a subscription: they will own a copy!), not only because of Doctor Zhivago; nor, let's say, for the letters, novels and poems of Daniil Kharms (publication by Vladimir Glotser); and not just because of the single page devoted to the poetry of Mariya Terentyeva, wife of writer Ivan Katayev, "who perished as a result of a false denunciation during the years of Stalin's terror," who shares the fate of many wives of those who were arrested and who had written poems in the Mordvinian Camps. And Nikolay Shmelev's article must be studied in the most careful manner—if, of course, you are not indifferent to the cause of perestroika.

Many people make fun of my superabundance of zeal in my recommendations. But I am convinced that even a lone individual, who thoroughly realizes and understands the goals and missions of perestroika, can be an active, thoughtful fighter for perestroika—that is, a genuine patriot of his socialist Fatherland. But intuition alone, feelings of kindness and fairness alone, cannot

make a person a truly active fighter for perestroika. A person must educate himself, in order not to find himself helpless when faced with lawlessness and arbitrary rule. As it turned out, for example, with the magnificently good and kind person in the acutely contemporary novel by Levian Chumichev, "Under the Staircase" (URAL, No 4). Having developed feelings of kindness and fairness, a person with such fine human qualities will in no way hinder perestroika or jam a stick between its spokes; he will on the contrary support perestroika, and help it to the best of his abilities.

But you see, that's just it—to the best of his abilities. I see my own mission as helping people to increase their strength and do everything possible that the forces of those who fight for perestroika will become strong.

Our strength today lies in the knowledge, that there are no alternatives to perestroika. Our strength today lies not just in our decisiveness, but also in our ability to stand up to everyone who, while cleverly hiding behind demagoguery such as the slogan, "I cannot give up my principles," wants to dismantle perestroika.

Our strength lies in not fishing around in our pockets for a word when they say, "Look where your perestroika has gotten us," or "Look at the fruits of your glasnost." The words which you utter must be precise, convincing, explanatory, and understandable to those who stand around silently and listen; they must be winning words, and they must be spoken at the right time. For when one cannot manage to draw a word from one's pocket from 13 March through 5 April, for example, the mood of the people becomes very sour.

And our strength lies in the fact that the people maintain a good disposition. Therefore I repeat: whoever wants to be an active participant in perestroika rather than a passive observer must read the materials which help him to understand its essence and its tasks; to grasp the meaning of the radical economic reform; and to understand the kind of heritage it is that we are rejecting. I urgently recommend, therefore, that the following be read with special attention: the articles of G. Lisichkin, O. Latsis, A. Strelyaniy, and Yu. Chernichenko. One should work on the article of N. Shmelyev in the April issue of NOVYY MIR with pencil in hand; it will help bring our civic feelings to fruition. After all, we all work somewhere, and therefore, we can also have an influence on something in a positive sense. Shmelyev tells us how to have an influence, what to fight for, and whom to oppose.

And then there are the works of Mikhail Antonov (which are willingly printed by MOSKVA, MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, and NASH SOVREMENNİK); I believe they are worth reading in case one feels bold enough to take up the cause of radical economic reform; or if one feels the need to take up arms in the struggle with wage-leveling, the cooperative movement, and cost

accounting. Mikhail Antonov, whose oratory basically deals with the usefulness of enthusiasm and the harmfulness of material incentives is, of course, well armed with arguments.

Everyone has the right to say what he thinks. Therefore, Antonov too has a right to come out against Aganbegyan; and Salutskiy has the right to contrast his own conception of the conceptions of Strelyaniy, Lisichkin, and Shmelyev. But no one, I hope, plans to encroach on the right of a columnist for OGONEK to call things by their rightful names. The article published in PRAVDA on 5 April (Everyone knows what I am talking about) somehow finally convinced me: In response to the open manifesto of the anti-perestroika forces, everyone to whom perestroika is dear must solidly close ranks: democracy must be defended. Petty disputes must be put aside; they can be argued later. We have had enough of reticence, and resorting to euphemisms. Until a phenomenon is clearly labeled, with singular expressions, understanding is impossible.

Now there is no need for us to hide our faces nor to use substitute expressions in order to protect the cause, as did the main hero in "White Clothing", Fedor Dezhkin, who personified so well the specific characteristics of present-day Soviet Man. On the contrary, we must show our faces and pronounce the words—otherwise we cannot guarantee the success of the cause. (I cannot but, by the way, note with joy the fact that the magazine LITERATURNNOYE OBOZRENIYE has published an article by Aleksandr Gangnus on Vladimir Dudintsev's novel, "White Clothing," which rates the novel highly.)

In our discussions and arguments on the article, "I Cannot Abandon My Principles," in my opinion, everyone's position been defined once and for all. For it is a struggle between Stalinism and Leninism: two different philosophies and two different points of view. The differences are fundamental.

Here the ominous figure of the Generalissimo is no more than a symbol, the imprint of Stalinism. Stalinism as a philosophy, as a system of views, as the ideological foundation and the embodiment of the administrative-command method of control, is simply not compatible with socialism. Stalinism is in sharp and relentless conflict with socialism, and is opposed to it—because the essence of the communist ideal lies in the fact that the condition for the development of each individual becomes the condition for the development of all.

The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA article of 13 March is still fresh in everyone's mind, but as if in order to fix its basic melody and its pathos in our souls, the April issue of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA has published an article by M.I. Malakhov. I reiterate: everyone has the right to express his own opinion. But, my dear Comrades, you just have to read for yourselves to see what elegiac and at

times elevated, romantic tones the author employs to recount the years of Stalinism: how such enthusiasm reigned; how science and the arts flourished; how high the morality was...

Look here! Can there be anything more immoral than a dissertation about the high degree of morality of a society which subjected nearly every tenth member to repression? Are there not at least some limits to man's cynicism?

I don't know whether or not the editors of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA discussed the article, "I Cannot Abandon My Principles," or not; or whether M.I. Malakhov's article was published with their support or not. Or did all that come about by chance, with no duress at all? I would advise my colleagues, and I would urgently advise the workers on that youth magazine to get together and read it aloud. Well then, at least the narrative by Nikolay Zabolotskiy, "The Story of My Confinement," from the March issue of the magazine DAUGAVA: "A stream of water under high pressure struck me and scalded my body. They forced me into a corner under that stream, and after a long struggle, they burst into my cell all at once and kicked me all over. I was in a state of shock and was out of my head; I was tortured physically, and was subjected to starvation and sleeplessness..."

I know, colleagues, that you won't search for a copy of DAUGAVA just for the sake of Zabolotskiy, much less read it aloud collectively. But you will read my article, this article, in order to give OGONEK its due. And that is why I copied out those few lines from the memoirs of the poet. You see, you can't help but read them here.

And having read them, can you really think about Stalinism, about Stalin's rule, as you did before, in such elegiac and lofty, romantic tones? Can you really—after reading those lines—still try to find some sort of justification for Stalinism?

Incidentally, these days not so many people are apt to utter the words, "They didn't jail them for nothing;" for glasnost, even such a youthful glasnost as ours, has already managed to accomplish a good deal. And if after three years of perestroika we have achieved nothing more than this—then for this alone we must say "Thank you" to perestroika. The people will learn the truth about their own recent past.

The nation is cleansing itself, shedding tears for their countrymen who were innocently condemned, put to death, or suffered severely.

Tell me: can one—in fact, is it not possible that, considering oneself a part of the people and wanting what is good for one's own people—can one not desire those tears, that cleansing, that enlightenment? Can one help but consciously ask the forgiveness of all those who suffered from the cruel terror, "for everything that happened for which I was and was not to blame?"

I am just asking, but I think that one could not; it would be impossible, unthinkable.

"I, who was born in 1956...can say with an honest heart—and let those who were imprisoned during the 30's and 50's, or even my own contemporaries, come and get me if it is not so—that I am as much a victim of the personality cult as they are. That is, I can stand in front of a picture of Goltzyakov with my own baggage, with my own kit." This is the voice of poet Aleksey Ivlev from the March issue of DAUGAVA. They are discussing the picture of Albert Goltzyakov, "The Epitaph"—Dedicated to Those Who Were Innocently Condemned During the Stalin Cult" (the picture was reproduced both on the dust cover and on a color insert to DAUGAVA).

"I too am a victim of the personality cult," says a 32-year-old man. A pose? If so, then only to a certain extent. Thirty years of Stalinism, and yes, 20 years of post-Stalinism have left a deep imprint on all of us. Can we really speak seriously about the untrammelled development of every individual—during the course of all those years? Honestly and seriously of course, we cannot. The victims of Stalinism are not only those warped personalities; not only those who perished in the camps and prisons; not only those who were maimed and morally crushed. What of the peasants and the farmers, who were unable to do normally the most important business on earth—grow food and care for the soil? And what of the workers who were unable to realize the capabilities and talents of their own individual personality; who were unable to fully show their own worth; who on the contrary, were turned into hacks, shoddy workers, and drunkards? And what of the scientists who, in the name of a chimera, were forced to reject what was true? And the writers, and musicians, and artists? And the engineers, whose work came to naught; and the teachers, who lost all their self-respect?

And the children, our children, in whose eyes we were degraded?

The Fourth-graders of School 158 in Moscow are competing for the right to bear the name of Pavlik Morozov. Right now, in this academic year. And I ask, "But what do you have to do; what do you have to complete?" "Well," they respond, "we have to study hard, and collect newspapers..." "OK," I think, "so be it. After all, they could require other feats of them..." But the children are not the guilty parties. Nor was Pavlik guilty of anything. It is society that bears an enormous guilt, for distorting the most fundamental concepts of morality. He was a victim of Stalinism. But you see, even that Pioneer Leader who today is urging the children on in the competition to bear the name of Pavlik—she is also a victim of Stalinism. These are its far-reaching consequences...

Well, what of it? Should we put up with that too? In my opinion, no way. If someone feels that the Fourth Grade has to compete for the right to bear someone's name (Oh!

That competition is in my view nothing less than far-reaching consequences too.); but nevertheless, if it seems that way to them, then one should see to it that the competition makes sense, and hopefully good sense.

A remarkable event took place in the magazine LITERATURNAYA UCHEBA: it published an article by D. Urnov, "On the Benefits of Disagreements." It takes issue with the article by Igor Vinogradov from the preceding issue, which I so urgently recommended you to read in my last review (it was, in my view, first-class literature). And so, Urnov takes issue with Vinogradov. I find this event remarkable because the critic appears in a completely unexpected aspect: We have become accustomed to the fact that this is a highly-educated person, a person of independent views, an assertive person.... Either that was a mistaken impression, or he has changed. But the article was written in such a manner that if one did not know how highly educated Urnov is, one could altogether come to the conclusion that he studied in Leningrad to be a technologist, and that he was the favorite pupil of N. Andreyeva.... Judge for yourselves: "Who among my contemporaries is talented?" Urnov asks, as if inquiring of himself: "Gennadiy Shpalikov and Anatoliy Peredreyev. The most remarkable manifestation of Soviet art? 'Chapayev,' of course. The best contemporary film? 'A Simple Story.' Who is immortal? 'Arkadiy Gaydar.' You understand me correctly, I hope. I don't want to suggest that it is only the author of 'Timur and His Team' who in my view will endure forever. Or to suggest that aside from 'Chapayev' there are no great accomplishments in our art. I have something else in mind: of that which I have seen or read, the things which I have cited, according to what I was taught, bear the attributes of immortality or greatness. And I stand on that. As to whether some other figures and works will ever attain eternal life, I cannot say. It is possible that some works which are inaccessible to me will turn out to be classics, by virtue of some kind of qualities which I am unable to distinguish. It is only with respect to those attributes which are known to me that I wish to say: Now that, in my opinion, is talent; that is immortal... For example, I cannot conceive of any remarkable work that I have not cited..."

Forgive me for the lengthy quotation. But had I abbreviated it you simply would not have believed me; you would have said, well—she lifted it out of context. Urnov, in this article, also lists what he does not like: "Ivan Denisovich," "Doctor Zhivago," Pasternak's translations, and the songs of Okudzhava and Akhmatova. And he refuses to read NOVYY MIR, which under Tvardovskiy was an oasis of free thinking.

All this would be fine: but then the self-interrogation, his questions and his answers to them—that, of course, is shocking, you will agree. It's not that one should feel offended for Mayakovskiy, for Sergey Prokofiev, or for Sholokhov. It's nothing to them, as they say. But then about Timur. Has it been long since the critic has re-read him? He writes that he recently tried to re-read "In the

Trenches of Stalingrad," but he disliked it very much; simply hated it; he couldn't do it. What about Timur? Did he really re-read it recently and find it so stirring? Did he really read it and think: "Now that is literature! That is timeless! That is the book of the century!"?

Lord! What is the matter with such people? And why, oh why, in a young people's magazine? That, after all, is a sin. In such a beautiful magazine, with the letters of Petr Chaadaye, and with the memoirs of Pavel Florenskiy... And along with those pages on Florenskiy—marvelous ones—this strange, inexplicable story.

Oh my, the anti-perestroika people have so many concerns of late. Glasnost must be hemmed in; markets must be dispersed; they must see to it that television does not become undisciplined: there is all kinds of rock there, and the ensembles—juveniles as it were (even their faces are seditious). And they must have at least something nasty to say about everyone who has been rehabilitated. (One must look upon them objectively: objectively, I say; there is no need to idealize them!) And they must not waste a single chance to cry out in time, in connection with the next publication which seizes the minds and hearts of the people—that there is nothing whatsoever in it that is especially artistic; that in the old days everything was freely published, and they were peerless articles. But that is not the most important thing. The most important thing is—not to lose their sausages.

Comrades, you will come to appreciate it eventually. Principles, which as they say have won more victories than cavalry and chariots, are nonetheless only principles. And ideals once again are nothing more than ideals. And what will a bureaucrat risk if perestroika proceeds in the proper manner? After all, society will then inevitably come to the conclusion that everyone in society should strictly tend to his own affairs; that we don't need 30 sets of instructions and five supervisors to inspire the working man; we don't need five levels of management to settle a single project, or two policemen to chase down one crippled old woman, or an artists' council to approve every Rublevian ringlet; and we don't need to maintain a separate desk supervisor to look after the location of women selling potato pies on the streets. Well, if all that finally takes place, did you think about where a bureaucrat would buy his sausages? You didn't? Well, I'll tell you: the thousands and thousands of representatives of the administrative-control apparatus will have to buy their sausages right where you and I do: once every ten days, if you're lucky; and after standing in a long line.

I hope that you now understand what these people have to risk.

The anti-perestroika people have no faith whatsoever in the possibilities of socialism (They believe only in the possibilities of Stalinism); therefore it seems to them that you and I should never have to worry about having too many sausages.

I know my explanation sounds too simple. But you know, we are often prevented from understanding a situation precisely because we intentionally complicate it and couch it in peculiar, complicated terms. That is one of our traits—also a collective trait, and one of the “far-reaching consequences.”

But I want to tell you that the time you and I spend together is not for nothing, and is not wasted: I can foresee wonderful far-reaching consequences! The publication of Vasilii Grossman's novel—Who can gauge its influence on the many thousands of minds it stirs up? And right now, even as we are listening to one another, do we really not notice the effect from reading “Children of the Arbat,” “White Clothing,” “The Foundation Ditch,” “Chevengur,” or “The Heart of a Dog”? Look around you and listen carefully; this influence is enormous, and it will not pass without leaving traces. We are becoming different people.

Has our impression of our own Soviet literature truly done justice to the literature itself? That impression has not changed. Our pride in our own culture, and consequently in our Fatherland—did it truly correspond to the true riches and the real achievements of this culture? And now it has grown. Who would dare to say that our poetry is in decline, when we have Akhmatova's “Requiem,” when we have “By Right of Memory”; when we have Boris Slutskiy?

And just try to tell me now that our present-day literature is, allegedly, not up to that of the last century, when we have “Life and Fate”!

The magazines serve their great cause not only for today; not only in paying tribute to the past; but also for the cause of far-reaching consequences, for our children and grandchildren.

Take the February issue of DAUGAVA, for example: chapters from an autobiographical book of Osip Mandelstam, and a large selection of reminiscences about him. And in January, there were the poems of Georgiy Adamovich (And an excellent article by Grigoriy Niki-forovich, doctor of biology, “The Right to be Different”; thoughts on why, alas, the “drab ones” among us are so often “the starters and the winners”).

The last issue of TALLIN had a marvelous tale by Yukhan Peegel, called “The Fugitives.” The action was set in the time of Peter the Great; but it could have taken place in 1941, or right now, or anytime. It is always timely when life, death, love, a woman's rights and a man's honor are the subject of literature. That same issue contained poems from the literary heritage of Henrik Visnapuu, who died more than 30 years ago in New York. I shall quote one of his poems, as translated by Aleksey Korolyev:

Let me be sorrowful. In sorrow, any one of us Tends to do good, Listening to the voice of God, A still, silvery sound. Let me be sorrowful.

I did not cite these particular words by chance. Just think: perestroyka even permits us to be sad. After all, it has not been so long ago that it would have been impossible to publish such a verse. And in the days of the personality cult, you and I would not have been permitted to be sad: who could allow it, “In our times, when the entire Soviet people, as one man...”?

It seems to me that previously it would not have been possible for us to read Z. Zhuravleva's novel in NEVA. I recommend from the heart, “A Romance with a Hero—Congruently—A Romance with Oneself.” It is written as more than a contemporary work, and is even almost capricious. But if you want to read about the ennobling, eternal love of a splendid woman (a modern woman) for a real man (And I hope you will agree with me, that the main attribute of manliness is devoted service to a cause)—you will not miss the opportunity to read this work.

The March issue of PROSTOR has published the poems of Vladimir Narbut, with a foreword by Lev Ozerov. And Boris Strugatskiy presents three young fantasy writers to the readers; three Andrey's—Izmaylov, Karapet-yan and Stolyarov. Interesting.

The April ZNAMYA (And how many meanings does the word-combination “Znamya Aprelya” contain), altogether according to form but with surprisingly rich content previews, with a foreword by V. Lakshin, the anti-utopian novel, “We” by Ye. Zamyatin. In the same issue: Georgiy Adamovich's reminiscences on Bulin; and Lev Gumilev's “The Biography of a Scientific Theory, or an Auto-Obituary.” An unheard-of genre! And, a clear, concise, impassioned and ironic exposition of an extremely complex scientific theory. In the April issue of YUNOST: a play by Boris Mozhayev; a story by Yuriy Nagibin; chapters from a novel by Ernest Hemingway; and an article by Andrey Turkov, witty and extremely intelligent, which ends with the remarkable words of Tolstoy in his letter to Gertsen: “These people are so timid—they cannot understand that the ice is cracking and breaking up right under their feet—yet this itself proves that the man is moving; and there is only one way not to fall through—that is, to keep on walking, without stopping.”

VOLGA informs in the March issue that upcoming issues will publish Lev Gumilevskiy's memories of Gorkiy, Sologub, Averchenko, Pilnyak and Platonov. Also V. Nabokov's novel, “Kamera obskura,” as well as Boris Yekimov's novel, “My Parent's House” (This is very interesting; you and I know Yekimov as a splendid story-teller...What kind of novelist will he turn out to be?). And, I.F. Taratin's reminiscence, “The Lost Years of My Life”—the author spent nine years at Kolyma, waited to be shot in an execution chamber, and was put into the mines...

And I am far, far from naming everything. Could someone really believe that everything that we have read can somehow be canceled, drowned in demagoguery, declared poor artistry, and force us to once again praise "the novels of stagnation"?

It is well-known that those in the humanities are kind. Some writers are now breathing sighs of sorrow for that poor "schoolteacher" who wrote the article for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. "She," they say, "was only voicing her own opinion; and now she is being badgered left and right in the press."

Well, perhaps it's true. Why don't we take the poor "schoolteacher" by the hand? Let's adopt her; let's take up a collection for her, and send her letters of sympathy. What about it, Comrade readers?

But did you read, "Reminiscences on the 'Doctor's Plot'" by Ya. Rapoport in the 4th issue of DRUZHBA NARODOV? Here is what should be discussed at gatherings; this is what one should talk about at lectures; and it would be well to reproduce it and distribute it too. Why? Well, there is not a great deal of material; the average busy person could handle it. It reads like an adventure novel. Even the most unsophisticated reader would find it appealing. And at the very same time it provides in a very concentrated form an impression of Stalinism. In the final analysis one would not have to know anything else; just read these reminiscences and everything will become clear.

One gets information on how handcuffs work, and just what the box is like at the gates of the inner prison in Lubyanka, at the same time. "I'd like to acquaint you with the peculiar furnishings in the dungeon now, hoping that for the reader this acquaintance will remain only a literary one," writes the author. Did you pay attention to the smallish word, "hoping"?

And on the whole, why are we so sympathetic toward some, and so strict toward others? When Igor Dedkov wrote a critical article about the novel "The Game" authors of some of the "rebuffing" articles (N. Fed in NASH SOVREMENNİK and A. Lanshchikov in MOSKVA) used extremely abusive words with respect to the critic. I stopped counting at 20, but the magazines are still dealing with Dedkov, and those who were slow to notice his article in time are now rushing into print. From the articles dealing with critic Andrey Malgin, calling him unpatriotic, an intriguer and the like (I don't want to repeat it), one could compile a monograph of 30 pages or so. In reading the critic's sections of last year's magazines, I came to understand that the greatest disaster to befall our literature is Malgin. But that wasn't enough. They drew up a letter to all the levels of authority, collected 40 signatures for it, and hand-carried the anti-Malgin letter to the authorities themselves. When Olga Kuchkin permitted herself to laugh, in the pages of PRAVDA, at V. Belov's very funny novel, "It's All in the Future" (in my opinion, it is just about as

funny as V. Kochetov's novel, "Just What is it You Want?", or I. Shevtsov's novel "Tlya" "The Plant Louse"—we amused ourselves with these masterpieces of elegant prose in the 1960's, and I treasure them so much that whenever I feel sad I open them—and they are still funny)—and so, when Olga Kuchkina showed her amusement, there was not a single literary rostrum from which the gentlemen of literature did not rain down choice swearwords on her. When Tatyana Tolstaya let fall exactly one (in all: one) unguarded word about the novel of that same Belov—the magazines did not spare the pages with which to nail her to the pillory, and the literary orators pounded the lecterns to pieces with their fists (And she wrote this in MOSKOVSKIE NOVOSTI—unless you are an ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary you won't even get to read it, the circulation is so small); and finally, they tried to humiliate Tolstaya by not accepting her as a member of the Writers' Union (by the way, they soon realized that they were humiliating themselves, and they did accept her). Now then, all this is going on, and no has a thing to say about persecution. "What persecution?" they say. "It's the normal literary process."

And so, I don't think anything will happen with the "poor schoolteacher" either. Her name, after all, was signed to an article not about some novel, nor even a very great man. Her name was placed on an article directed against perestroika, against an entire range of questions on perestroika, against the strategy and tactics of perestroika. And so, just let the schoolteacher get a grip on herself, and have patience. Yes, let her think about it: the proponents of perestroika are defending themselves from the anti-perestroika group and even their attacks on them are on the whole rather toothless. I am not convinced that, should those who think like the schoolteacher win; that is, if perestroika were to lose, to retreat, to abandon its positions—well, I am not convinced that those who think like the schoolteacher would act quite so humbly. Their system of views professes a different morality, different principles of war.

To the reminiscences of Rapoport in DRUZHBA NARODOV, I would add as mandatory material for reading and discussion in the widest possible circle, the reminiscences of his daughter, Nataliya Rapoport, as well: "Memory—That is Medicine Also." They were published in the April issue of YUNOST. Just as one is vaccinated against cholera, against smallpox, or the plague—I would make it mandatory for teachers of literature to read these reminiscences aloud, in class, to the children. Let them shudder; let them burst into tears and let them be horrified—those would be shudders of purification and a horrification of healing. They must know what Stalinism does to a person; they must be vigilant, and be able to distinguish it under any guise, in order to fight with it, not sparing oneself. Because it bears within itself perdition, both physical and moral, to the country, to its citizens, to their children and grandchildren.

O people, you who talk about the decline of morality and spirituality in our society in these days in comparison with the years of Stalinism! You will not seek out YUNOST, nor DRUZHBA NARODOV; you consider them just more publications of "negative phenomena," "which cast our history in a dark light," or part of the "flood of destructive literature." You would find reading all this boring; you would get tired; you would be irritated by this. All right, here is a paragraph for you—one paragraph—read it: "How the people swore at the bloody murderers and their entire nation! How they thirsted for retribution! How they heated up these emotions in all the mass information media available to them at that time! They refused treatment from Jewish physicians. It smelled of a pogrom. The question of how the perpetrators were to be executed was widely discussed. Informed circles in my class asserted that they would be hanged in Red Square. We were worried: would there be free access, or would one need a pass? We finally agreed that one would need a pass: otherwise the curiosity-seekers would crowd one another, and they might damage the Mausoleum. But someone reassured us: don't worry, they will probably take movies. And I dreamed of Vovsi being hanged and woke up with a cry..."

Our children are deprived. What on earth are we doing to them? That execution on Red Square never took place. Apparently an old Russian auntie prayed to Rapoport's non-Christian God, and for all the martyrs together. Auntie Kseniya had appealed to the priest: could she pray for a Jew? He said that she could. Thus, Auntie Kseniya, finding a compromise with a clergyman and the Russian God, saved not only the martyrs; she also saved those who dreamed about receiving a pass to the execution—from seeing a horrible dream come true.

"For a long time the coming of the Golden Age was associated with one truly major, historically controversial personality—I.V. Stalin," writes V. Chalmayev in the April issue of MOSKVA. Can you hear the syrupy intonation? Read the sentence carefully, one word at a time. It is interesting to note that this sentence was altogether unnecessary to the article as a whole, and to the paragraph from which it was taken; even there it was awkward. But it was necessary to the magazine, which carefully, on the sly, but persistently strives to "give what for" to everyone who now understands the evil and nasty nature of the words, "Father of his People."

Leaf through issue number four carefully. See what Valentin Sidorov writes about India, and about a popular Indian poet. "It just so happened that the first poem I had occasion to hear him recite was about Stalin." "It just so happened," that Sidorov was pleased to quote the poem itself.

And now take the reminiscences of D. Pavlov about A. Shcherbakov. How strict, how unpretentious, how attentive and fair Stalin was. "It just so happened," that the author of the reminiscences could not remain silent about this, and the magazine could not help printing it.

Well it's true, though, that nothing about Stalin was able to get into Karamzin's "History." Incidentally, that was one of the reasons for which I welcomed the appearance of the "History" in MOSKVA. "It just so happened," that issue after issue, the magazine serves up apologetics for Stalin, while the prose is poor in issue after issue as well. It is extremely strange: here is a magazine in the capital—and how many outstanding writers there are in the capital—and how "un-capital-like" the magazine is in terms of the level of the articles. And so I thought that it would be better for them to present Karamzin.

It is interesting that the Moscow writers' organization (It says in the masthead of MOSKVA that the magazine is its organ) puts up with such "un-capital-like" articles, and puts up with apologists for Stalin. It is interesting. Why? If you give it some thought, that such a powerful writers' organization is powerless in some area, then you have to answer another question—in what area? If you decide that such a talented organization is in solidarity with the apologists—that means becoming very disappointed in it... Well, I don't know what to think, Comrade readers. Perhaps you can tell me? If it seems to you that the case I have made in connection with the apologetics for Stalin is too flimsy and there's not enough to ponder over, just pick up another issue, page through it just as carefully as I paged through this one: You will see the picture more clearly.

Well, as to what this "truly major personality" was like is made very clear in the reminiscences of Konstantin Simonov in the latest issues of ZNAMYA. Simonov writes about Stalin in great detail; he reproduces his numerous meetings and conversations with him with great accuracy; the notes on his conversations were made with respect, with deference and even reverence—all the feelings which at that time Simonov attached to Stalin. I feel sorry for Simonov. But let us try to console ourselves with the fact that with this testament, Sidorov has made a sacrifice to us—in order that we might rid ourselves from our last illusions (those of us who had illusions) with regard to this "truly major" personality.

I will not risk recommending Simonov's reminiscences for urgent reading much less public discussion. They are rather hard to read, and I am not convinced that they will be of interest to everyone. But I reiterate, that people who still think that there was greatness in the personality of Stalin, that he was an enigma, should read them in order not to remain captive to illusions.

And then there are V. Tendryakov's stories, from the third issue of NOVYY MIR.

You simply must read them—in order to understand "the kind of heritage we are rejecting," and in order to equip yourselves with additional arguments against Stalinism.

"We will be truly free from the influence of alien ideas only on that day when we fully comprehend the path we have traveled; when whether we will it or not, the admission of all of our delusions and all the mistakes of the past escapes our lips; when a cry of repentance and sorrow, the echo from which will fill the entire world, is wrested from the depths of our souls. Then we will, naturally, take our place among the nations; the place in which we were destined to act, not only as battering rams and clubs, but in the realm of ideas." I have quoted Petr Yakovlevich Chaadayev, from Vladimir Kantor's article, "A Fateful Name," published in the March issue of the magazine VOPROSY LITERATURY. And this is whom we should now be reading. But, it says in the article, "The ban on publication remains practically to our day." And is that not so? Do you have Chaadayev on your bookshelf today? Then when was it published? By what publishing house? SOVREMENNİK, published last year with a circulation of 20,000, was banished so thoroughly, that even the best Moscow stores saw not a single copy. On the other hand, hundreds of copies wound up, they say, in Chukotka.

Do you know who is not publishing Chaadayev; who is cutting him to 20,000 copies; who is banishing him to Chukotka? It is the Stalinists, my friends; and let us not be deceived on that account. They do not wish us to associate with the bitter and angry prophecies of Chaadayev—that "knight of absolute freedom." They do not want us to learn about ourselves with his help. Because if we learn about ourselves, then we will also gain a better understanding of their ruinous role in our fate and in the fate of our Fatherland.

Just think about this: In 1987, 20,000 copies of Chaadayev's work were printed; whereas the preceding year, one million copies of the work of Anatoliy Ivanov, chief editor of MOLODAYA GWARDIYA, were printed by the very same publishing house. Well? Is any comment necessary? Perhaps I should use ridicule or treat the subject with irony? Or should I treat it with calm reasoning? And perhaps arguments should be sought in favor of just such a correlation?

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," "Ogonek," 1988.

09006

OGONEK Tells Story Behind Romm's Films on Lenin, Stalin

*18000556 Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 25, 18-25 Jun 88 pp 10-11*

[Article by Arkadiy Bershteyn: "Two Films and 630 Meters of 'The Cult'"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] This article is just part of the truth about Romm, a man whose difficult path was crowned by the film "Everyday Fascism." We will return to the story of this brilliant and original artist more than once in the future.

Mikhail Ilich Romm once remarked: "It goes without saying that many people of our generation are paying for too much success and too many honors which they earned during the years of the cult of personality."

Romm was delighted by the civic courage of S. M. Eizenshteyn who "at the height of Stalin's cult of personality" consciously raised his hand against this cult by producing the second part of "Ivan the Terrible," the great film "about the tragedy of tyranny." Mikhail Ilich was a man of extraordinary creative energy that, for many reasons, was far from exhausted. He continued tortuously searching for new ways, even when he was no longer young and understood very well that "at the age of 60 it is not that easy to remake yourself" and that "the vestiges of the cult of personality must be liquidated in oneself."

In the 1960's Kharri Stoychev, a student-practitioner from Bulgaria, often audited the classes Romm gave at VGIK. He was Romm's assistant in the film "Everyday Fascism," and put together (with S. Kulish) a second film from the remaining story. Soon after he was able to get a video camera, which was very rare in those days, and he decided to make a film about his teacher. He caught Romm at his dacha, in his apartment, and at the studio. One late evening 2-3 weeks before Romm's death Harri found him at his kitchen table, in a dressing gown and little old beret. Without a thought he began shooting...

"How long are you going to torture me! All the same, nothing will come of it," Mikhail Ilich said, but quickly softened. "All right, I will tell a story. But I warn you, it is about many people."

Romm's story was named "An Interview with God." We will give it in the version of film director Aleksey Shcherbakov, to whom Stoychev showed his videotapes in 1971.

"I dreamed once," M. I. Romm began, "that I had died. And God summoned me and asked, 'Tell me how you lived, well or badly, righteously or not. I want to know this from you so that I can treat you as you deserve.' Of course, I did not believe in God. But, understanding that my days on earth were already over, I looked with trepidation at my past and said to myself, 'Yes, you were a sinner. You lied, dodged, hurt friends, and from weakness of spirit did not follow your conscience. Therefore you have no chance to get into heaven.' I told this to God. He listened, and responded, 'It is good that you speak the truth. Now what do you want from me?' I asked God to give me a chance to be born again and live my life so as to avoid my former mistakes and spiritual weakness. He smiled slightly, 'They rarely succeed at that, but since you told the truth and you yourself are asking, let it be done. But I am afraid that nothing will change in your life.'"

"So then I was born again, and became this same person who is sitting here now and completing his second life. Then I died again, and again came before the Almighty, and again heard the question, how had I lived the years that were given to me. I understood that I had not lived this long second life any better than the first. I had again lied when I could have told the truth, turned away from friends in their times of trouble, and twisted my soul out of fear for my position. I had known the correct way to live, but I could not do it, and now I judged myself harshly. Upon hearing these words God asked severely, 'And what is it you want this time?' I timidly expressed a wish to live life a third time, to finally justify the lofty purpose of the human being. But I already sensed that I would not receive permission from above and would soon pass into non-existence for having used my whole 70 years so stupidly! God said, 'I'll have to think about it.' And at that moment I woke up.

"The older I get the more I love children. When I see a child I remember this dream for some reason, and I want to stay a child for my whole life. You know, there are people in whom childish immediacy and purity does not die out as they mature! And that is a characteristic of talent."

"All this was shot," Shcherbakov relates, "at medium range, with simple lighting, somewhat intimate. When Mikhail Ilich raised his hand or turned sideways, at that place in the frame where there had been a head or an arm a translucent outline appeared of the body part that had moved, and this created a unique, slightly mystical air."

You must agree that not every artist has such dreams. And certainly not every one is ready to retell them.

In 1962 Romm wrote: "We owe a debt to the Soviet people because we did many untruthful pictures and spoke dishonestly about things that have to be told and remembered all the same." In those years he said that he would do both his Lenin films in a completely different way, and gave a restrained appraisal of the new edited version (after the 20th CPSU Congress Romm removed 630 meters of "the cult" from the films).

On 10 November 1937, reporting on the release of the film "Lenin in October," TASS depicted it as a film that was "exceptional for the strength of its dramaturgy and inimitable for the strength of its acting, marvelous direction, montage, and camera work."

A great deal was said and written about the creation of the film "on the initiative of Comrad Stalin," and behind this one sensed the idea that Stalin was supposed to see himself in an appropriate role on the screen for the first time.

Recalling work on the film, A. Ya. Kapler, the author of the screenplay, wrote in the 1960's that he "tried to emphasize Stalin's role in the October events," and he did so "sincerely" because he was "hypnotized by the

universal devotion to Stalin." He goes on: "History is history. Confusion is confusion. Neither I nor the entire film collective were 'playing to the market,' tailoring ourselves to the situation; we acted in conformity with our ideas and convictions, with the understanding that we had then of the historical process." Nonetheless, it is hard to believe that the artist was completely blind. In those same memoirs we find an honest admission that during work on the screenplay Eyno Rakhya, the Finnish Bolshevik, loyal Leninist, and party courier who accompanied Vladimir Ilich to Smolnyy, was purged and had to be replaced with a made-up character, Comrade Vasiliy.

Kapler's screenplay, "The Uprising," which received a prize in the closed government competition for best plays and screenplays about the October Revolution, did not reach Romm's hands until late May 1937, and the picture had to be released by 7 November.

M. Romm's decision to take on the difficult or, as many thought, impossible job and his rejection of the role of director/co-producer were in large part a result of his desire to work actively in cinematography and finally affirm his place as a film director. After all, not long before this he had been discharged from the studio. From the podium at the House of Cinema Vishnevskiy had criticized him harshly for "kamernost", and his work on the film "Queen of Spades" had been stopped in early 1937.

Kapler's screenplay, in which Romm saw "great possibilities," had to be completely reworked in cooperation with the author, taking into account the endless criticisms of the contest commission. The adventure-filled plot line about how cleverly V. I. Lenin slipped away from the secret agents of the Provisional Government occupied a significant place in it, and the episode where Grigoriy Timofeyev gave his life for Lenin was invented. But the main thing in the film was the depiction of Vladimir Ilich, who appeared on the screen in close, indoor scenes; this was a direct challenge to the apologists of pseudomonumentalism, who were trying to make Ilich into an ikon. All the same, we find in the film many historical inaccuracies, exaggerations, and unjustified liberties. Lenin, while still in his steamboat compartment returning from Finland, asks Vasiliy to carry an article for PRAVDA to Comrade Stalin and to set up a meeting "right away tomorrow," then in the secret apartment he reminds Vasiliy of this; even in the captions it is indicated that Lenin and Stalin's "conversation" lasted 4 hours. Arriving at Smolnyy Vladimir Ilich again asks that Comrade Stalin be found, and so on. Even the historic session of the Central Committee on the eve of the revolution is shown in a reflected manner, through a half-open door, from the viewpoint of Vasiliy. Speaking at this meeting, Lenin says that he "does not see the difference between the proposals of Trotskiy and Kamenev," who are for some reason called "sad

optimists." But we do not find out what these proposals are, even though it is common knowledge that Trotsky and Kamenev took different positions during the October days.

After reworking of the screenplay and the preparatory period, the director set 12 August as the first day of filming. The film had to be completed in two and one-half months. Many cinematographers, including both defenders and enemies of the picture as well as ordinary hyper-cautious people, did not believe they could make it in such a fantastically short time. Under these very difficult conditions M. I. Romm showed superhuman persistence and got B. Z. Shumyatskiy, the head of cinematography, to agree to make "all shops and the entire Mosfilm organism entirely subordinate" to his picture. P. M. Kerzhentsev, chair of the Committee on Artistic Affairs, opposed the director's demands that Boris Shchukin be released from work in the theater and tried to convince him that the idea of recreating the image of Lenin in cinema and the theater was doomed to failure. And Shumyatskiy, for his part, did not want to approve of Nikolay Okhlopkov in the role of Vasiliy; the director used him at his own risk. When Shumyatskiy came to the filming site he did not even speak to the actor, and one of the editors kept a kind of behavior log in which he recorded all changes in the dialogue, arbitrary actions by the director, and so on. Aleksey Dikiy was supposed to play the Bolshevik worker Matveyev, but as Romm's former assistants told me later, Dikiy did not show up for the filming because he was arrested. The same night he was replaced by the actor Vasiliy Vanin.

Both Romm and other members of the filming group told later of strange things that happened during the intensive work on the film. One surprise followed another: one time the optical instruments were ruined, then the electrical cable was cut, then a light whose mount had been sawed through fell with a crash, or a cameraman or actor would stop working. And M. I. Romm's wife, the well-known actress Yelena Kuzmina, relates in her memoirs that the film was often ruined and the photographic equipment was broken. Locks on the safes did not help.

It was apparent that someone wanted to create the impression that wrecking was occurring at Mosfilm—it was that kind of time. The one who was later purged was Shumyatskiy, who had conveyed the impressions, recommendations, and remarks of Stalin to the director and the filming group.

But despite the "wreckers" the work went quickly; as Romm recalls, half of the frames "were shot in one run, without repetition."

The problem of choosing an actor to play Stalin was quite complex. At this time many actors in the theater had begun playing this role. As Boris Shchukin's son Georgiy tells in his unpublished memoirs, the creators of the film tried to test Irakliy Andronikov in the role. He

could imitate Stalin's speech marvelously, skillfully conveying his heavy, tiring pauses; but on the screen the needed degree of resemblance was lacking. Ultimately Romm selected the little-known actor Semen Goldshtab. He later played Stalin in Leonid Lukov's film "Aleksandr Parkhomenko" and on the stage of the Kirov Oblast Dramatic Theater. But Goldshtab was not successful as Stalin. Stalin himself preferred another performer, the Georgian actor Mikhail Gelovani, who in fact became Shchukin's partner in Romm's next picture, "Lenin in 1918." In the 1930's alone he played the role of Stalin in three more pictures, "The Great Glow," "The Vyborg District," and "The Man with the Gun."

In 1970 D. Vasilyev, second director of the film, said that he had tested the interesting actor V. L. Zuskin for the role on Lenin without Romm's knowledge, but it did not work out, while Shchukin's tests immediately pleased everybody. The experienced makeup artist A. Yermolov found a way to make him up that did not constrain him or hinder his facial expression. The makeup man had to completely transform many features of Shchukin's mobile face. The remarkable Lenin makeup was created in a few sessions. Yermolov called this a work of art and it was possible primarily because the makeup man had seen the living Ilich up close three times.

Shchukin told Romm that he wanted to play Ilich in such a way that the audience would smile, maybe even laugh, from his first appearance on the screen. Romm made very subtle use of Shchukin's talent for improvisation. For example, they read the artist a letter from the countryside which Vasiliy and Natasha had received, and Shchukin responded in a Leninist way, "Well, well, a very sensible letter!" This wording was used in the picture. The actor had enormous charm and, happily, it turned out that Goldshtab, playing Stalin, looked like a living mannequin next to Shchukin. Shklovskiy remarked that, in depicting Stalin, "the director went no further than showing a relative resemblance." Was this Romm's conscious intention? Hardly. But there is no question that Ilich dominated the picture "Lenin in October."

After the release of the film "Lenin in October," which it was enormously popular in those years, Romm was still told that he had not given a deep enough picture of Stalin, whose image had already become solidly established in the theater and cinema.

Even the famous army leader P. Dybenko, who was soon to be purged, remarked in his enthusiastic comments on the film that Stalin should have been shown more.

A. Kapler and T. Zlatogorovaya's screenplay "Lenin," which became M. I. Romm's second Lenin film, included many more episodes in which I. V. Stalin took part. Stalin later suggested that this picture be called "Lenin in 1918."

Stalin's role on the Tsaritsyn front was enormously exaggerated in the film. He firmly rejects "Trotsky's traitorous plan," removes the military specialists from command, and together with K. Ye. Voroshilov, who becomes commander of the Tsaritsyn front, organizes a brilliant offensive and telegraphs V. I. Lenin that the enemy has been smashed. We see Stalin talking with wounded soldiers; his car dashes along the front line without regard for shells exploding nearby.

The events on the Tsaritsyn front in 1918 are deliberately put in the foreground, and Stalin's actions, it appears, instill such fears in the conspirators that they "plan" to kill him right in Tsaritsyn on 30 August 1918 simultaneously with the elimination of Lenin and Sverdlov in Moscow and Uritskiy in Petrograd on the same day.

But what really was happening in Tsaritsyn in those days?

Let us go back to the summer of 1918. In May former Lieutenant General A. Ye. Snesev arrived in Tsaritsyn with a mandate from the Soviet of Peoples Commissars signed by V. I. Lenin. He was appointed military head of the North Caucasian District Commissariat for Military Affairs. Snesev was able to form regular units from the scattered detachments and combat groups, organize the defense of the city, and stop General Krasnov's 40,000-strong army. But Stalin demanded that "A. Ye. Snesev be taken away," accusing him of sabotage, and declared the former general's plan to defend the city to be a wrecking plan because it carried "the stigma of defensism." The situation at Tsaritsyn stabilized in mid-July, but Stalin on his own removed, then arrested Snesev. Not long before this "action" he had put almost the entire staff of the district in a floating prison on a barge, falsely accusing the military specialists of organizing a counterrevolutionary conspiracy. The Supreme Military Council sent an inspection team to Tsaritsyn headed by A. I. Okulov, a member of the VTsIK. Snesev was quickly released, and the military specialists also returned to freedom, that is, of course, those who had not already been shot. By organizing the risky offensive Stalin thwarted Snesev's carefully thought-out plan, and the city was half surrounded. In a letter to Lenin Stalin tried to put all the blame on Snesev.

In September 1918 the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front was established, including I. V. Stalin and chairman of the Tsaritsyn Soviet S. K. Minin; Major General P. P. Sytin was appointed front commander with full personal authority, and K. Ye. Voroshilov was named his assistant. But Stalin and Voroshilov refused to obey the order; they demanded the "collegial form of control of the front and collegial decisions on all operational questions," thus preventing Sytin from taking command. K. A. Mekhonoshin, member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic who arrived together with P. P. Sytin, insisted on obedience

to the order from the Center. But the front Revolutionary Military Council headed by Stalin arbitrarily removed Sytin from command and petitioned to have Voroshilov appointed in his place. The party Central Committee reviewed the conflict. In a telegram addressed to Stalin, Minin, and Voroshilov on 2 October 1918, Central Committee secretary Ya. M. Sverdlov demanded that they obey the decision from the Center and "put the decisions of the Revolutionary Military Council into effect." But even after this Stalin did not stop his destabilizing actions in Tsaritsyn for a long time. First he wrote to Lenin demanding a review of the "question of the military specialists from the camp of the non-party counterrevolutionaries," then after receiving a strict reprimand from Lenin he submitted a petition to retire from his posts, then renounced this petition, then made serious political charges against Sytin in letters to Sverdlov, to the Central Committee, and so on.

In the 1930's A. Ye. Snesev, P. P. Sytin, A. I. Okulov, and K. A. Mekhonoshin were purged.

In the film "Lenin in 1918," which came out in 1939, one could sense the impact of the trials of the 1930's, the false accusations made against many prominent Soviet and party workers and military leaders, who were turned into "traitors, foreign spies, and enemies of the people." Some former members of the Politburo and Soviet Government, despite differences in their positions and the complex history of their interrelations, were depicted as all the same, "corrupt cheats and hypocrites." Nikolay Ivanovich Bukharin got it worst of all: he was acting in direct alliance with the conspirators and, most absurd of all, took part in organizing the attempt on Lenin's life. If a viewer were to watch the first version of the film today, he would be amazed to learn that Bukharin and Pyatakov were assigned leading places in a new counterrevolutionary government, that Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Trotsky supported the officer companies that raced into the Kremlin, and that Lenin accused Bukharin of Uritskiy's death and schismatic activity in the party.

In one scene Lenin and Stalin are talking about the harsh suppression of the resisting classes and the need for a "steel" dictatorship; this sounds almost like a justification for the repressions of the 1930's.

The myth that Lenin and Stalin were great friends was further elaborated in the picture. Vladimir Ilich rushes to embrace Stalin, saying, "Hello, my good friend, my buddy." For some reasons telegrams from Stalin get more attention from Lenin. In his turn, Stalin suffers greatly on hearing the news of the attempt on Lenin's life, and looks tenderly at the sleeping Ilich.

During the years when only a few people remembered Lenin's "Letter to the Congress," the opinion ascribed to Lenin was that Stalin was his one true and most dependable successor. It penetrated the thinking of millions of

people, in great part helped by the cinema. For example, the wounded Vladimir Ilich turns to Professor Mints and says, "If this is the end I have to give instructions. Summon Stalin."

Once during the filming Mikhail Ilich suddenly sensed how silly it was in the text of the concluding scene that Lenin, who still had not recovered from his wound, "seated the young and healthy Stalin in an easy chair, while he himself sat on a stool." In response to this remark by the director S. S. Dukelskiy, who was head of cinematography at the time, without a word took a copy of the screenplay out of the safe; on the last page was the official word: "Very good, I. Stalin."

I do not think any commentary is needed here. In 1956 Romm painlessly cut out all these statements and episodes with Stalin.

The filming this time was relatively tranquil. All the photo and screen tests of the actors who played members of the Soviet Government of that day were turned over to the First Department of the film studio. They searched out and sorted through every lost or disappeared frame. As before the creative activity of M. I. Romm's cinema group was closely monitored. The screenplay was revised with the knowledge of I. V. Stalin and according to his remarks. He viewed all the screen tests and working material of the picture, most frequently the episodes that had been shot and mounted.

One time assistant director T. B. Berezzantsev, who played a significant part in selecting actors for the film, saw German Mikhaylovich, the brother of Yakov Mikhaylovich Sverdlov, in the studio. German had the modest job of consultant. He was an international specialist by profession, and a very charming and well-educated man. "Looking closely at him," she said, "I saw

an intelligent face, expressive eyes, and a remarkable resemblance to his brother, whose part I thought he could play well." Romm approved Berezzantsev's choice immediately; he was struck not only by the resemblance, but also the "naturalness and simplicity of this man." Makeup artist Yermolov did an excellent job on him, and G. M. Sverdlov began to play a role in the film; and all the professional actors, in particular Plotnikov and Shchukin, readily helped him. Unfortunately, all the enormous work done with G. M. Sverdlov was in vain. A few finished episodes were shown to Stalin, who ordered that all scenes with German Mikhaylovich be refilmed because he considered it unsuitable for this role to be played by a relative of Ya. M. Sverdlov, indeed one with the same last name.

The mass scenes, taken in the pavilion, are stunning in their artistic precision and the expressive composition of the picture. Lenin's speech at the Mikhelson plant on the tragic 30th of August was filmed by Boris Volchek in one long uninterrupted segment, to show the indivisible unity of the leader and the masses. Romm considered the assassination attempt scene to be the best episode in the film "Lenin in 1918." After Kaplan's shot Lenin falls and is instantly surrounded by the crowd. Then suddenly the camera rises upward. Now the audience sees the ring of people around the prostrate Ilich from overhead. Lenin is then carried off in a car, which moves through the spreading crowd. This same overhead viewpoint allows us to see the path made by the car through the multitude of people engulfed by terrible grief. And in this picture, as Romm explained, the image forms of a heart, torn from the vast crowd of human faces. Unfortunately, the fact that "the leader was lying on the cold ground" frightened the bureaucrats, and the scene had to be cut from 15 to 7.5 meters.

11176

Roy Medvedev on Khrushchev's 1957 Consolidation of Political Control

18300344a Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian
No 25, 18-24 Jun 88 pp 6-7

[Excerpt from political biography of N. S. Khrushchev written by Soviet historian Roy Medvedev: "N. S. Khrushchev. 1957—The Year of Strengthening Positions." First two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] I recall that in the summer of 1957 there was a brief report in the press regarding the recently held CPSU Central Committee Plenum. This news report told of the anti-party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich, and Molotov. At that time there many different rumors about the attempt to unseat CPSU Central Committee First Secretary N. S. Khrushchev from his post. Yet the truth has remained a secret "behind seven seals" to this day. Couldn't we tell about this event today, in the time of glasnost?

N. Fedorov, veteran of labor and the party, Alma-Ata.

We offer the reader an excerpt from the political biography of N. S. Khrushchev written by Soviet historian Roy Medvedev.

On 18 June 1957 the CPSU Central Committee Plenum gathered in the Kremlin. This meeting was unusual in that it lasted 3 days. The Kremlin was under increased guard. The Presidium members could only rest late at night, so as to again return to the meeting room in the morning. Only F. R. Kozlov was not present. On 23 June the triumphant celebration of the 250th anniversary of Leningrad was to be held. Delegations from other cities throughout the country came to the city on the Neva. Many of them were headed by obkom secretaries. N. S. Khrushchev was expected to come as the head of the government delegation, but Khrushchev had no time for anniversary celebrations.

At the Central Committee Presidium meeting, Molotov and Malenkov unexpectedly presented the question of unseating Khrushchev. Khrushchev's opponents who had been at odds with each other this time united their efforts and, maintaining a strict conspiracy, discussed the question of his removal. In general, they accused Khrushchev of economic voluntarism and of illegal and hasty actions. Many of these accusations were undoubtedly just. However, the main accusation, which was not fully expressed but which was the most important for Khrushchev's enemies, was the fact that he had supposedly gone too far in denouncing Stalin, that he had undermined the authority of the CPSU in the international communist movement, as well as the authority of the entire communist movement. Thus, there was discussion of reviewing the decisions of the 20th CPSU Congress. Khrushchev's enemies, anticipating success, also discussed ahead of time the fate of Khrushchev himself. If he admitted his mistakes and agreed to resign,

they were planning to demote him, say, to the level of USSR Minister of Agriculture. If not, the possibility of Khrushchev's arrest was not excluded. He was still very popular not only among the people, which could be overlooked, but also among most of the CPSU Central Committee members. Therefore, it seemed dangerous to leave him to his freedom. V. M. Molotov was to be elected to the post of CPSU Central Committee First Secretary.

However, N. Khrushchev decisively rejected these accusations, referring to the economic success which had been achieved and to the significant achievements in foreign policy. Three members of the Presidium spoke out in support of Khrushchev during the heated debates: Mikoyan, Suslov and Kirichenko. Seven Presidium members—Molotov, Malenkov, Voroshilov, Kaganovich, Bulganin, Pervukhin and Saburov—spoke out against Khrushchev. The Presidium candidate members—Brezhnev, Zhukov, Mukhitdinov, Shvernyak and Furtseva—supported Khrushchev. However, they were present at the meeting only with the right of consultative voice. At one of the meetings, Kaganovich cut off Brezhnev in a very rude manner, and Brezhnev became so agitated that he was close to collapse. Despite the fact that he had no decisive voice, Zhukov's position was extremely important, since he made it very clear that the army would support Khrushchev. Shepilov at first supported Khrushchev, but in the course of the lengthy debates he unexpectedly changed his position and sided with the opinion of the majority of the Presidium members.

Finally, the Central Committee Presidium decided to unseat Khrushchev from the post of CPSU Central Committee First Secretary. However, Khrushchev, supported by his proponents, refused to obey this decision. He said that it was not the Presidium which had elected him to the post of Central Committee First Secretary, but rather the Central Committee Plenum, and only the Plenum could unseat him from this post. He demanded a convocation of the Central Committee Plenum. This request was rejected by the Presidium. However, the Molotov-Malenkov group placed too many hopes on the formal decision of the Presidium. Khrushchev was supported not only by the army, but also by the KGB as personified by the KGB Chairman I. A. Serov. The working apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee remained in Khrushchev's hands. In other words, it was Khrushchev himself who held the real power in the country and the party during those decisive days. Therefore, the "operation" which had been planned in the beginning of March 1953, when a small group of leaders could resolve all the questions on distribution of power over the grave of the recently deceased Stalin, could not be carried out in June of 1957.

While the Presidium was meeting, important events were going on outside its doors. For the more influential members of the Central Committee it was no secret that the fate of N. S. Khrushchev was being discussed in the

Kremlin. They informed Kozlov of this in Leningrad, and he immediately came to Moscow with a group of Central Committee members. Serov and Zhukov were able to quickly arrange for almost all the other Central Committee members to come to Moscow. They promptly demanded a convocation of the Plenum. The Central Committee Presidium rejected this demand, and even refused to meet with the representatives of the Central Committee. Then a large group of Central Committee members sent a written resolution to the Kremlin. It stated:

"To the Central Committee Presidium. We, the members of the CPSU Central Committee, have learned that you are discussing the question of the management of the Central Committee and the management of the Secretariat. These questions which are so important for the entire party cannot be concealed from the members of the Central Committee Plenum. In connection with this, we, the Central Committee members, cannot stand aside from the question of our party's management."

However, this resolution also had no effect. Then the Central Committee members began to gather in the Kremlin. A group of Central Committee members headed by I. Serov, who was the chief of security in all the Kremlin buildings, came to the building where the Presidium meetings were being held. The majority of the Presidium, considering Khrushchev to be practically unseated from the position of head of the party, assigned Bulganin as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and Voroshilov as USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, to enter into negotiations with the Central Committee members. However, Khrushchev and Mikoyan also came out into the reception room. This meeting began on a none too polite note. Voroshilov began swearing at Serov. The latter would not be outdone. He threatened that if the Presidium opposed the convocation of the Plenum, the Plenum would meet without the approval of the Presidium, since the members of the Central Committee would not let the questions of party leadership be resolved without them. This threat was quite real, since most of the Central Committee members were already in Moscow, and were quite decisive in their attitude. It became evident that the plot against Khrushchev had failed, and the Presidium was forced to agree to a convocation of the Central Committee Plenum.

The overwhelming majority of the participants in the convening Plenum wholeheartedly supported Khrushchev. The June Plenum was unprecedented not only in its character, but also in its duration. It took place from 22 through 29 July. The Plenum heard the speech of Khrushchev, "On the Position in the Party". Molotov was given the opportunity to present his point of view in detail, but everyone who spoke subsequently supported not Molotov, but Khrushchev. Under the circumstances, Voroshilov, Bulganin, Saburov and Pervukhin decided to speak out with penitential speeches. Malenkov also

admitted his errors. Only Molotov was stubborn to the end of the Plenum, and he was the only one abstaining in the vote on the Plenum resolution. All the other participants in his group voted for the resolution, condemning their own behavior.

The Resolution adopted by the Plenum and a brief report on its work were published only on 4 July 1957. The Plenum decisions spoke of the "anti-party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich, and Molotov," and kept silent about the participation of Voroshilov, Bulganin and others. Both Voroshilov and Bulganin retained their posts. Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, and "Shepilov who had joined them" were expelled from membership in the Presidium and in the CPSU Central Committee. Saburov lost the post of Central Committee Presidium member, while Pervukhin became merely a candidate member of the Central Committee Presidium. The June Plenum increased the membership of the Central Committee Presidium to 15 members, and the recent candidate members were granted membership status in the Presidium. These were L. I. Brezhnev, Ye. A. Furtseva, F. R. Kozlov, N. M. Shvernik, and G. K. Zhukov. A. B. Aristov, N. I. Belyayev and O. V. Kuusinen also became Presidium members. The names of A. N. Kosygin, A. P. Kirilenko and K. T. Mazurov appeared among the 8 Presidium candidate members. Molotov, Kaganovich and Malenkov lost the positions of first deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers. Instead of D. T. Shepilov, A. A. Gromyko was appointed to the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The day after the Plenum, Kaganovich phoned Khrushchev and, according to the testimony of the latter, had the following conversation:

"Comrade Khrushchev! I have known you for many years. Please don't let them treat me as they dealt with people under Stalin..."

"Comrade Kaganovich! Your words once again confirm the methods which you were ready to employ in order to achieve your vile goals. You wanted to return the country to the order that existed under the cult of personality. You wanted to hold reprisals against people. You measure others by your own measuring stick. But you are wrong. We firmly adhere to, and will continue to follow, the Leninist principles. You will get a job. You will be able to live and work in peace, if you work honestly, as all Soviet people work."

N. S. Khrushchev kept his word. None of his enemies were then excluded from the party, but all of them received assignments outside of Moscow. Molotov was sent to be the USSR ambassador to Mongolia. Kaganovich became the director of the Urals Potassium Combine in Solikamsk, and Malenkov became the director of the Ust-Kamenogorsk GES at Irtysh. Shepilov received a professorship in Central Asia. In July of 1957 Pervukhin and

Saburov lost the positions of deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers. A. N. Kosygin and D. F. Ustinov were named to the posts of Council of Ministers First Deputy Chairmen.

Soon after the conclusion of the Plenum, Khrushchev came to Leningrad as the head of a large delegation. The formal purpose was to give awards to Leningrad residents in connection with the 250th anniversary of the city. In fact, it was a repetition of the anniversary ceremonies. A large demonstration was held in the Palace Square. Standing on the tribunal were Khrushchev, Kozlov, Voroshilov, Mikoyan, Brezhnev, Kuusinen, Furtseva, Shvernink, and Aristov.

A few days later Khrushchev and Bulganin left for Czechoslovakia, where they spent about 2 weeks. Khrushchev told the Yugoslavian ambassador Vepko Mikunovic freely that he had no great desire to travel in the company of Bulganin, but that it was necessary for the time being because of state considerations. Naturally, the Yugoslavian ambassador told in a detailed letter to I. B. Tito about the events in Moscow, and reported that the position of Bulganin had clearly been shaken, and that the unseating of the latter from the post of prime minister was just a matter of time.

In late July and early August 1957 the 6th International Festival of Youth and Students was held in Moscow, which left a great impression of Muscovites. For the first time in the entire history of the USSR so many guests from other countries of the world had come to Moscow.

In September of 1957 Khrushchev was vacationing in Crimea not far from Yalta. This was his first long vacation in many years. He could not even think of a vacation in the late 30's or the first half of the 40's. Under Stalin Khrushchev was able to have a vacation at the seashore only one time—in 1947. In 1953-1956 Khrushchev had too many concerns to allow himself a lengthy vacation. Now he spent almost a whole month in the Crimea, and returned to Moscow only on 2 October.

12322

Medvedev on Khrushchev's 1964 Fall From Power
18300344b Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 27, 2-8 Jul 88 pp 5-6

[Excerpt from political biography of N. S. Khrushchev written by Soviet historian Roy Medvedev: "N. S. Khrushchev. 1964—The Year of Unexpected Overthrow." First paragraph is source introduction]

[Text] The publication of "N. S. Khrushchev. 1957—The Year of Strengthening Positions" (AiF No 25) evoked considerable reader response. In response to the requests of readers, we are presenting one more excerpt from the political biography of N. S. Khrushchev written by Soviet historian Roy Medvedev.

The end of the summer and the beginning of the fall of 1964 were filled with ordinary work for Khrushchev. After returning from Scandinavia and a trip to the CzSSR, he began to prepare a new agricultural reform. However, Khrushchev's project met opposition both in the circles of the Central Committee Presidium, and among the obkom secretaries, to whom the new reorganization seemed unnecessary and even harmful in light of the weak development of specialization in the kolkhozes and the universal interrelations of all sectors of agriculture. Yet Khrushchev insisted on the reorganization. He presented his proposals in a lengthy Memorandum, and sent it to all the party oblast committees and to the Central Committees of the republic communist parties. This question was to be discussed at the Central Committee Plenum in November.

In October Khrushchev decided to take a vacation at the state resort in Pitsunda. He did not feel tired or sick.

While he was at the resort, Khrushchev monitored the space flight preparations of the "Voskhod" craft with three cosmonauts on board, and also met in the south with various state leaders. Meanwhile, the expanded meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Presidium was already underway in the Kremlin, and Suslov and Shelepin had raised the question of unseating Khrushchev from all his posts.

Of course, this question did not arise in one day. Discussions of the question of the possible replacement of Khrushchev had been taking place in the circles of the Central Committee and the Presidium since the first months of 1964. The development of these sentiments and discussions was prompted also by the fact that in the 9 months of 1964 Khrushchev had spent 135 days on trips to various regions and countries. There is evidence of the fact that a more detailed discussion of the question of Khrushchev's removal was held by a group of Presidium and Central Committee members in September, while they were vacationing in the south. Invited by Stavropol Kraykom First Secretary F. Kulakov for hunting in the region of Lake Manych, these Central Committee members were less interested in shooting or fishing than they were in political discussions. N. G. Ignatov played an important role in preparing Khrushchev's unseating. For many years he had worked as secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and from 1957 through 1961 he was a member of the CPSU Central Committee Presidium. However, Ignatov lost Khrushchev's favor, and after the 22nd Congress he lost his high posts. In 1962-1964 Ignatov was Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. He did not have any real power in this position, but he was able to travel freely throughout the entire country and help create an anti-Khrushchev block.

After Khrushchev left for the south, the preparations for his overthrow were already underway in Moscow. As we can best judge, M. S. Suslov and A. N. Shelepin were at the center of the discussions. The fact that CPSU Central Committee Secretary L. I. Brezhnev and USSR Minister

of Defense R. Ya. Malinovskiy sided with them was of decisive importance. This excluded the possibility of any accidents. The Central Committee Presidium convened already after most of the members of the Presidium and most of the members of the CPSU Central Committee had expressed their opinion in favor of unseating Khrushchev.

On the morning of 13 October Khrushchev met the Minister of France, G. Palevskiy, at his resort home. Just as Khrushchev was about to invite Palevskiy to dinner, he received a telephone call. Brezhnev was calling to tell him that the members of the Central Committee had gathered in Moscow and wanted to hold a Plenum to discuss Khrushchev's proposals on agriculture. Khrushchev expressed his extreme displeasure:

"This question is not urgent, and furthermore I am on vacation, and they can wait".

But Brezhnev insisted. R. Ya. Malinovskiy also came to the phone. Khrushchev's resistance was broken only when Brezhnev told him that the members had gathered and that the Plenum was going to discuss the outlined questions without his participation if he did not come.

"Very well," said Khrushchev with annoyance. "Send a plane..."

Mikoyan also flew to Moscow with Khrushchev. At the airport in Moscow Khrushchev was greeted only by KGB Chairman V. Ye. Semichastnyy. It became evident to Khrushchev and Mikoyan that the discussion at the Central Committee Plenum would certainly not be centered around the structure of agricultural management.

Twenty-two people participated in the meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Presidium. Aside from the members and candidate members of the Presidium, USSR Ministers A. A. Gromyko and R. Ya. Malinovskiy and several obkom secretaries were also present. Among them was the secretary of the Volgograd obkom, A. M. Shkolnikov, who had spoken out sharply against Khrushchev.

Khrushchev himself presided over the meeting, and no stenographic record was kept. The discussion was stormy, sharp, frank, and at times very rude. Khrushchev decisively refuted almost all the accusations addressed at him and himself levelled many accusations addressed at the Presidium members in attendance. Only Mikoyan spoke out in defense of Khrushchev. He announced that Khrushchev's leadership is a great political asset to the party, which it has no right to spend so freely. But no one supported Mikoyan.

It was obvious—to Khrushchev as well—that the CPSU Central Committee Plenum which in June of 1957 had supported him and refuted the decision of the Presidium would not be on his side this time. Nevertheless, among the 330 Central Committee members and candidate

members, Khrushchev might have a few dozen supporters, and the discussion at the Plenum also might not be too smooth. The Central Committee Presidium members wanted to avoid this.

However, they were unable to convince Khrushchev to retire "voluntarily," and the meeting which began on 13 October had to be adjourned late that night for a recess. Everyone went home, agreeing to continue the meeting on the morning of 14 October. However, that night Khrushchev called Mikoyan, who was also still up.

"If they don't want me, then so be it," said Khrushchev. "I won't object any more."

The next day the meeting of the Central Committee Presidium lasted for no more than an hour and a half. The recommendation was presented to elect L. I. Brezhnev as First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and A. N. Kosygin as USSR Council of Ministers chairman.

According to the testimony of Michelle Taty, as early as 31 October 1963 when Khrushchev was meeting the leader of the French socialists Guy Molpierre, the latter asked him about the new generation of Soviet leaders who could inherit his power. In his answer, Khrushchev placed L. I. Brezhnev, whom he praised very highly, in first place. Then he named A. N. Kosygin, whom he praised for his competence. Khrushchev also named N. V. Podgorniy. We see that Nikita Sergeyevich named his successors quite accurately, although he did not suspect that all these changes would take place so soon.

On the afternoon of 14 October the CPSU Central Committee Plenum convened in the Kremlin. Its members had already come to Moscow from all parts of the country.

The Plenum meeting was called to order by L. I. Brezhnev. A. I. Mikoyan served as chairman. Khrushchev was also present at the meeting, but didn't say a word during the entire meeting. M. A. Suslov presented a speech at the Plenum. This speech lasted only one hour. In it, he made no effort to analyze Khrushchev's activity over the past 11 years, nor to summarize or to draw conclusions. This was an extremely superficial document, whose content was reduced primarily to a listing of the personal shortcomings or "sins" of Khrushchev.

Suslov said that Khrushchev had allowed gross errors in his work and in the management of the party and the government, that he had made rash, hasty decisions, and that he had allowed organizational reshuffling. In the last 2-3 years Khrushchev had concentrated total power in his hands, and had begun to misuse it. All the achievements and success in the country he ascribed to his own personal merits; he completely ceased to have any consideration for the Presidium members; he did not listen to their opinion, and he was constantly preaching to everyone.

In general these criticisms were true. We must say, however, that Khrushchev had concentrated full power in his hands not 2-3, but rather 5-6 years ago, and that the members of the Presidium turned to him too infrequently with critical comments. More often they were his "yes-men." A large part of Khrushchev's rash and hasty decisions was implemented through the CPSU Central Committee Presidium and Plenum.

Suslov said that the press wrote more and more about Khrushchev's achievements. In 1963 the central newspapers published Khrushchev's portrait 120 times, and in the 9 months of 1964—140 times. Meanwhile, even Stalin's portraits were printed only 10-15 times a year. Khrushchev surrounded himself with advisors made up of relatives and journalists, and listened to them more than to the Presidium members.

Here too Suslov left much unsaid. Stalin's portrait was published in the central newspapers much more often than 10-15 times a year. Khrushchev was always travelling around the country. He travelled abroad more than 40 times, and all this, naturally, was reflected in the central newspapers. Yet Stalin almost never left Moscow or the Kremlin. Suslov clearly exaggerated the role of Khrushchev's son and daughter. They had practically no influence on their father in resolving important matters of state. It is true that there were many sycophants in the press and party ideological organs. But these were, as a rule, members of the Central Committee, and not unrelated people. Among these toadies we may also name part of the members of the Central Committee Presidium, whom Khrushchev himself had promoted.

Furthermore, Suslov spoke very critically about the division of party leadership along the production principle. This work became the beginning of what seemed to be two parties—a party of the workers and a party of the peasants.

However, in late 1962 this reform did not meet any opposition in the CPSU Central Committee, and at that time was approved by Suslov himself.

Suslov was sharply critical of Khrushchev's proposals on creating specialized administrations within agriculture. The Central Committee Presidium called back Khrushchev's memorandum on this subject, and tabled its discussion.

Khrushchev, as Suslov said, imagined himself to be a specialist in all fields: in agriculture, diplomacy, science, and art—and tried to teach everyone. In the GDR he acted as if he were in one of the USSR oblasts, and tried to teach the Germans how to manage their agriculture. Many of the materials prepared by the Central Committee apparatus Khrushchev published under his own name.

In the first part of these reprimands Suslov was, undoubtedly, correct. Khrushchev did not suffer from a lack of humility, and even made a number of observations to American corn grower R. Garst, with which the latter could not agree. However, Suslov's second reprimand is unjust. Many of Khrushchev's directives and resolutions really were prepared by the Central Committee apparatus, but that is the direct responsibility of this apparatus. Suslov himself, speaking at communist party congresses in the West and East presented speeches which had been prepared for him by the Central Committee apparatus. We might add that Khrushchev participated even more in the compilation of such speeches than did Suslov.

According to Suslov's testimony, when Khrushchev sent memos to the Presidium members, he demanded written responses, sometimes giving only 40-45 minutes for them. None of the Presidium members could compose written conclusions in such a short time, and the Presidium meetings became a formality.

Evidently, such cases did occur, although not as the rule but as the exception. Khrushchev could not deprive the Central Committee Presidium members of their right to vote, although there were situations, as for example during the days of the Caribbean crisis, when he had the right to demand from the Presidium members a most urgent response to certain proposals.

Suslov said that Khrushchev had so confused the management of industry by creating state committees and sov-narkhozes [national economic councils], that it was very difficult to comprehend all of this. Industry today operates worse than it did under the former methods of management.

This reprimand of Khrushchev was just, although it was incorrect to make Khrushchev alone responsible for the poor work and for the poor management of industry.

As Suslov announced, Khrushchev conducted an incorrect policy in the sphere of price formation. Increasing the prices on meat, dairy products, and certain commercial goods dealt a blow to the material position of the workers. Khrushchev also pursued an incorrect policy in regard to livestock raising, as a result of which many cattle were slaughtered and the supply of meat was reduced.

Suslov was correct in accusing Khrushchev of an erroneous policy in the sphere of livestock raising. But if the increase in prices on meat and dairy products was a mistake, then why were the new prices retained even after the October Plenum? Why did prices increase on many commercial goods even in the 60's and 70's?

According to Suslov, Khrushchev was indiscreet in his speeches and conversations.

It is true that Khrushchev—both in his private conversations with correspondents and businessmen, and in his meetings with heads of state, and from the speaker's podium—often spoke not only with unusual, but often with excess frankness. Stenographic records of any of Khrushchev's conversations were thoroughly edited, and then simultaneously published in the foreign, as well as in the Soviet press.

Suslov also told the Central Committee members about some of Khrushchev's erroneous decisions in the sphere of foreign trade. Thus, for example, in the framework of a joint agreement, Poland had built an aviation plant for production of the AN-12 airplane, and the Soviet Union was to buy 500 such planes. However, Khrushchev rejected the purchase, stating that we can build such planes cheaper.

In the words of Suslov, in 10 years of work Khrushchev not only never met with Minister of Foreign Trade Patolichev, but never even called him.

It is difficult to evaluate these decisions by Khrushchev without knowing his motives. We may assume, for example, that Poland had asked too high a price for the AN-12 airplanes, much more than previously planned. It is strange that Khrushchev and Patolichev never met.

Among the examples of Khrushchev's arbitrary nature, M. A. Suslov focused on the episode with the Timiryazev Academy. When he learned that there were scientists at the Moscow Agricultural Academy imeni K. A. Timiryazev who did not agree with his agricultural recommendations, Khrushchev decided to expel the academy from Moscow, and to move its faculties to different remote areas. In doing so, he said: "They have nothing to plow on the asphalt." Suslov said that the members of the Central Committee Presidium did not agree with Khrushchev and put off the move under various pretexts, creating various commissions.

These accusations were entirely justified. While the transfer of the USSR and RSFSR Ministries of Agriculture to be based at the "Mikheylovskoye" and "Yakhroma" sovkhozes located 100-120 kilometers from Moscow was a clear mistake, the effort to destroy the Timiryazev Academy could serve as an example of clumsy arbitrariness and petty tyranny.

Suslov also subjected many aspects of Khrushchev's agricultural policy to criticism. Speaking out against the policy of fallow land, Khrushchev dismissed sovkhoz directors who retained bare fallow lands at the farms, ignoring the arguments. He also wanted to remove Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Kunayev, who defended the concept of bare fallow lands. Khrushchev removed Minister of Agriculture Pysin from his post without giving any explanation on this matter to the Presidium members.

In recent years, Khrushchev had unleashed a totally unjustified attack against kolkhoz subsidiary farming. He even gave the order to reduce and cut back personal subsidiary plots, which caused irritation on the farm, since the sections of land which had been taken away were usually not sown with anything and became overgrown with weeds. Khrushchev suggested to the USSR Academy of Sciences that it create two vacancies for election of Lysenko followers N. Nuzhdin and V. Remeslo to the academy. Academician A. D. Sakharov denied these two candidacies. Lysenko spoke out rudely in this connection, and later reported the matter to Khrushchev. Khrushchev was angry and announced that if the Academy of Sciences begins engaging in politics, then "we will disband such an academy, we do not need it." This became known within academy circles. In many oblasts Khrushchev proposed liquidating the kolkhozes and creating sovkhozes, motivating this plan by the inability of the kolkhozes to show a profit. Nevertheless, Suslov announced, kolkhozes are more profitable than sovkhozes.

All of these rebukes aimed at Khrushchev by Suslov were quite true, and they could have been continued. In many oblasts and rayons, personal subsidiary farming by kolkhoz farmers and sovkhoz workers had been degraded to a lower level than in 1953.

I further omit a number of petty objections and complaints which hardly should have been mentioned at the Plenum. In conclusion, Suslov posed the following question: "Could Khrushchev have been brought to order earlier? The Presidium members tried to do so. They warned Khrushchev, but heard nothing from him in reply except for rude rebuffs and insults." At the conclusion of his speech Suslov said that Khrushchev's overthrow is a manifestation not of weakness, but of courage and strength, and that it must serve as a lesson for the future.

During Suslov's speech the Central Committee members often shouted out comments which were directed against Khrushchev and testified to the annoyance which they had built up. When Suslov said that things were going toward a cult of Khrushchev, someone in the audience shouted out: "He has long been a cult". After the speech Suslov said that, judging by the comments, the Plenum approves the Presidium decision, and therefore there is no need to call for a debate. A decision was unanimously accepted in the following formulation: N. S. Khrushchev is relieved of his posts due to his advanced age and state of health. One other decision was made—in the future not to allow the duties of CPSU Central Committee First Secretary and USSR Council of Ministers Chairman to be held by the same person.

CPSU Central Committee First Secretary-elect L. I. Brezhnev said in his short speech that we should not pour dirt on ourselves. He recommended that the question of relieving Khrushchev of his duties not be discussed

in detail at the party meetings and conferences, and to say at the meetings of non-party members only that which would be published in the newspapers.

One of the western researchers wrote in regard to the Central Committee Plenum:

"The Plenum voted against Khrushchev, although, undoubtedly, it had some support. In a certain sense this was its finest hour. Even 10 years ago no one would have dreamed that Stalin's heir could be set aside by such a simple and mild method as a simple vote."

Nikita Sergeyevich himself said the same thing. When he returned home that night, he threw his briefcase down in the corner and said:

"Well, now I'm retired. Maybe the main thing that I accomplished was that they could remove me with a simple vote, while Stalin would have ordered them all arrested."

12322

Latvian Writers' Union Highlights Republic's Nationality Problems

Pugo Addresses Plenum

18000450 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 2
Jun 88 pp 1-2

[LATINFORM report on plenum of the board of the LaSSR Writers' Union: "With Faith in the Irreversibility of Restructuring Processes"]

[Text] The most burning issues of today, those which pertain to the problems of our society during this period of restructuring, are always at the focus of attention by Soviet Latvia's creative intelligentsia. This is the natural result of development of the processes of democratization and glasnost in our country; these processes have unleashed the power of initiative and responsibility for the fate of our Motherland and our people on the part of each individual. It represents a sincere desire to foster progressive tendencies of political restructuring which has given rise to active participation by writers and the entire creative intelligentsia of Latvia in all areas of social and economic affairs and to efforts to make their greatest possible contribution toward resolving the many acute problems in the development of our economy, culture, history, educational system, interethnic relations and environmental protection matters which accumulated during the years of stagnation.

This plenum of the board of the LaSSR Writers' Union, to which the heads of our republic's creative unions were invited, provided a forum for an honest, enthusiastic discussion of ways to overcome the barrier of errors and mistakes as well as a sober and in-depth analysis of the

past and present situation in our republic. On the agenda was the topic of "Current Problems in the Cultural Life of Soviet Latvia on the Eve of the 19th CPSU Conference." The plenum opened on 1 June at the LaSSR CP Central Committee House of Political Education.

Attending the plenum were comrades B. K. Pugo, A. V. Gorbunov, A. P. Klautsen, Ya. Ya. Oxherin, V. P. Sobolev, I. A. Priyeditis and deputy chairmen of the LaSSR Council of Ministers L. L. Bartkevich and M. L. Raman.

The plenum opened with an introductory address by Ya. Ya. Peters, chairman of the board of the LaSSR Writers' Union.

In his speech to the plenum participants he said:

"The time for big questions has come. On the shoulders of our creative intelligentsia rest thousands of questions like 'Why? How? When? How much longer? In what fashion?' Since it was announced that the Writers' Union was preparing to meet for its unified plenum we have been receiving many letters. Along with questions and requests for advice, people are also offering their help and making suggestions. And that means that now it is the time for action, a time to put our shoulders to the task and consolidate our efforts.

"It is with a profound sense of satisfaction that I mention the letters addressed to our plenum as I stand here at this podium today. Those letters stressed the idea of the development of a national state entity in the LaSSR on the basis of fundamentally new positions. Essentially, the people perceive this idea in close connection with the development and perfecting of Soviet federalism as a whole, in the way required by 20th-century civilization and a society of cultured people. In these letters, sent to us by workers and physicians, teachers and scientists, students and actors, engineers and peasants, the basic words were socialism, democracy and Lenin. And as a logical conformance to law there flow from these the words people, republic and justice. And, quite frankly, it is only for that reason that we have assembled here today, we who are the artistic intelligentsia and experts on almost all areas of human life.

"We have assembled here to seek a common point of view at a time when the curve of the revolutionary situation in our republic is nearing its zenith, the 19th All-Union Party Conference, at which the fate of restructuring will be decided.

"We are pleased by the fact that today we have with us the first secretary of the LaSSR CP Central Committee and the chairman of the Latvian Parliament, that we have guests from other union republics, that accredited members of the republic press are here along with correspondents from the all-union publications PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA,

TRUD, OGONEK, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY, Latvian Television, Central Television and All-Union Radio.

"We may regard our unified plenum today as a forum of Latvia's intellectual thought. I would like to note that of the 185 voting plenum participants, members of the boards of creative unions and experts in attendance there are 12 doctors of sciences, four academicians, 16 professors, one corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, two corresponding members of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, one active member of the USSR Academy of Artists, three winners of the USSR State Prize, 25 winners of the LaSSR State Prize, two recipients of the Lenin Prize, one deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet, five deputies to the LaSSR Supreme Soviet and two members of the LaSSR CP Central Committee. A total of 94 persons, one half of all plenum participants, are communists.

"Thus this plenum should be regarded as the Latvian intelligentsia's contribution to restructuring, a synchronization of watches with the people and with the times.

"We would have gathered here in vain today and tomorrow if all we did was talk and then go home. After consultations with the chairmen of the boards of all the other creative unions, we reached the conclusion that this plenum should draft a document for action, a program that will provide the basic theses for further action. Our plenum resolution could be that basic document; it will be published in the press and broadcast over radio and television. A second document could be a letter, based on our resolution, to the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

"For the sake of internationalism and Soviet federalism we must talk about the very foundations of the Union of Socialist Republics [sic]—the sovereignty of the republic as a state, and real equality among nations.

"In Latvia the situation with regard to the indigenous nation is especially pressing and miserable. For as the result of revolutions, wars, Stalinist repressions and Nazi genocide our people have been transformed into an ethnic minority in their own territory.

"If the intelligentsia is regarded as the people's conscience, then today that conscience should speak out. It should speak out and make constructive suggestions. The draft resolution of this unified plenum which we have drawn up sets forth those suggestions.

"Only an irreversible restructuring process can guarantee real solutions to our problems. Only consistent support for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's initiatives can ensure that the party wields authority and has the leading role on behalf of the development of all national groups.

"Legally unjustified actions during the personality cult and tyranny distorted the status of the united socialist Soviet states. Restructuring urges us to go beyond just words. Restructuring grants us rights and gives us an impetus for energetic action.

"Literature, the arts and culture have exerted an influence on more than one social process. We often speak of the party's influence on literature. But has great literature not also had a positive influence on the party? The state? Our social system? Have not works of literature and art educated for the party an entire generation of talented leaders whose time, as it becoming ever more clear, has arrived? This, too, is a matter worthy of consideration.

"I wish all participants in this unified plenum a penetrating and principled outlook, a keen sense of political culture and commonality of action in arriving at a diagnosis of Latvia's socioeconomic and nationalities problems, and that they may aid in solving those problems, so that our republic will have a genuinely socialist future within the framework of those processes which are occurring in the USSR, in Europe and throughout the world."

During the first day of the plenum a broad range of topics was discussed in speeches by M. E. Zalite, poetess, I. Ya. Ziyedonis, LaSSR people's poet, Academician A. A. Drizul, vice-president of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, Ya. P. Poriyetis, doctor of economic sciences and professor at Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka, E. Ya. Grinovskis, professor at the Latvian Agricultural Academy, P. P. Zalis, laboratory chief at the Silava Scientific Production Association and doctor of agricultural sciences, G. Ya. Saltys, chairman of the 9 May Fishing Kolkhoz, O. R. Latsis, first deputy editor-in-chief of the magazine KOMMUNIST and doctor of economic sciences, G. K. Asaris, chief architect of the city of Riga, P. A. Tsimdinysh, doctor of biological sciences and head of the General Hydrobiology Laboratory of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences Biology Institute, M. L. Lemeshev, UN environmental expert and doctor of economic sciences, P. A. Eglite, chief of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences Labor Resources Department, R. E. Veydemane, senior scientist of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Languages and Literature, and D. O. Skulme, LaSSR people's artist.

Discussion focused on the transcript of a meeting of the board of the LaSSR Union of Artists containing a critical appraisal of the circumstances surrounding the nomination and election of a number of delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference from our republic.

The plenum chairman read a statement by Professor V. K. Kalnberz, a deputy of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet and a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, addressed to the chairman of the board of the LaSSR Writers' Union. In the letter concern

was expressed regarding the intensive growth of Latvian cities, growth which is having a negative effect on the ecological situation in the republic and on the health of its citizens.

B. K. Pugo, first secretary of the LaSSR CP Central Committee, gave a speech at the plenum. He said:

"Esteemed comrades! First of all allow me to thank you on behalf of the Latvian CP Central Committee Buro for the opportunity to participate in your discussion.

"We regard today's plenum as a continuation of the businesslike and principled discussion of the most important ideological problems of culture which was begun at the May Plenum of the LaSSR CP Central Committee, as an expression of our intelligentsia's desire to make a greater contribution to the acceleration of restructuring.

"The intelligentsia of our republic, and writers in particular, has always been noted for its perception of the problems which have arisen along the path of Soviet Latvia's development. Even during the years of stagnation the poetry of Oyar Vatsiyetis and Vizma Belshvitsa, the publicistic work of Imant Ziyedonis, Andrey Dripe and Erik Khanberg, the prose of Regina Ezera and Alberts Bel, and the plays of Gunar Priyede and Pauls Putninsh portrayed shortcomings for what they were and aroused the people's consciousness and conscience.

"Latvia's progressive writers have always considered their work part of the overall work of the party. This was stressed very well by Oyar Vatsiyetis in his poem 'Membership in the Party.'

"Even prior to the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum our word artists had penetratingly and with intuition and sensitivity successfully portrayed the vicious effect of divergence between words and actions and other negative phenomena which were hushed up for a long time. In this connection we naturally remember the words of Lenin, who said that this is precisely the reason why the intelligentsia is called the intelligentsia, that it reflects and expresses the development of class interests and political factions throughout society more resolutely and more precisely than anyone else. These words also remind us that even today the intelligentsia's most important task is to reflect fully the interests of the people. The working people of our republic want Soviet Latvia to become richer and more beautiful, want to reveal fully the potential of socialism and democracy.

"Today the primary task of all our republic party and soviet organs is to create opportunities for doing this. We have a real chance to strengthen the sovereignty and expand the independence of our republic. In order to do so we must take full advantage of the rights granted each republic by the Constitution of the USSR and work to perfect the mechanism by which those rights are exercised.

"We also have businesslike suggestions to make concerning the development of the independence of local soviet organs. Many of these were put forward during preparations for the 19th Party Conference by workers and kolkhoz members, party officials and creative workers who sincerely wish the best for their people. Many of them have already been studied in detail by the LaSSR CP Central Committee and the Council of Ministers and form the basis for the joint letter sent by us at the beginning of April to the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers. That letter contains 84 specific suggestions pertaining to expansion of the rights of our republic in the fields of planning, finances, pricing, distribution of goods, labor and wages and development of the social and cultural sphere. It would take a good two hours merely to recite them all.

"Since under the rules I do not have those two hours, allow me to stress the most important points. Our proposals are intended to ensure that the fundamental principle of socialism—"to each according to his work"—is strictly observed at the republic level as well, so that as Latvia's economy begins to function better it will be the working people of our republic who will be the first to feel the positive effects.

"As far as I know the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have received similar proposals from other republics as well. We are confident of a positive reply. The grounds for that confidence are provided by the fact that this important matter was reflected in the CPSU Central Committee theses published in advance of the All-Union Party Conference. These state: 'The key to further development of nations and at the same time to reinforcement of friendship among them and the cohesion of Soviet society lies in integral combination of the independence of union and autonomous republics and other national formations with their responsibility for all-union and state interests.' But it must be borne in mind that this is by no means a task that will be performed in a single day, nor one which will be performed by our people alone. It is obvious that there will also be a need for some legislative acts at the nationwide level. And those acts are already being drawn up.

"We are attentively observing how similar issues are resolved in neighboring republics. Much that is of interest in this respect is occurring in Estonia.

"Our economic administrators are also not sitting idly by. As of next year they will begin an economic experiment in which the relationship between the union budget and our republic budget will be placed on a normative basis. Now all enterprises, regardless of whose jurisdiction they fall under, will pay a certain percentage of their profits into the republic budget. According to preliminary calculations this will permit us to increase 1989 allocations for the development of the social and cultural realm alone by 66.5 million rubles.

"The suggestions made at today's plenum will also be analyzed most carefully; some will be carried out by our republic, and others will be brought to the attention of the all-union government and of the participants in the upcoming party conference.

"As you are aware, at that conference our creative intelligentsia will be represented by poet Yanis Peters, writer and journalist Erik Khanberg, publicist Daynis Ivans, and performer Girt Yakovlev. They were chosen at the recommendation of the creative unions. And you have a right to order them to defend your interests in a fitting manner at this important party forum.

"Today the speeches of many plenum participants have expressed an earnest desire to comprehend the most acute and complex problems, to find ways and means of resolving those problems. And although at times emotions do gain the upper hand, I feel that there is nothing terrible about that. Even in the most extreme viewpoint there is always something useful, for the person who advocates his cause in a distinctive way is nevertheless reflecting real sentiments and problems. This is not an antagonistic struggle, but rather a discussion, a common quest for the best solution to our accumulated problems. But I feel that there is no need to dramatize that process artificially, either.

"We were reminded of this in the speech given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at his meeting with the heads of the mass media, ideological institutions and creative unions. I recall his words: 'We cannot advance the cause of restructuring, the objective of which is to bring socialism into line with the parameters of Leninist thought in the people's interests, by pitting one group against another.' We do not need to apply labels, but rather to seek our common ground, not dispersing but instead consolidating our forces, our entire creative potential.

"I think that you will agree that we have only just begun learning how to conduct a discussion. There are many among us who still lack political culture. Sometimes they even lack the patience to hear their comrades out. This is bad. It is even worse when some self-assured person attempts to pass off his own opinion or the opinion of a group of his comrades as the opinion of all the people. They attempt to speak on behalf of the people. Yet to make such statements the very least that is needed is serious sociological research and objective, fully valid information. We must rely in drawing our conclusions less on intuition and more on science, on the real state of affairs.

"We must all learn not only how to speak, but also how to listen. We must not only criticize, but also learn how to accept criticism. Respect for one another and tolerance of the opinion of one's opponent can only be for the good, and will aid in finding solutions to our most acute

problems. And no one would call the problems that have been submitted for our consideration simple ones. To many of them there is no single, unambiguous answer.

"For instance, is it a simple matter to give a pat answer with regard to overcoming the shortcomings created in our society by the Stalin cult and the administrative-command style of leadership? It is no easier to answer the question of how to ensure that restructuring becomes irreversible, so that its fate will not depend upon either the kindness of the conservatives or the mercy of the extremists.

"Each of us has a right to his opinion on these and other matters. The only right we do not have is to regard our own opinion as the most correct. I feel that it is on this basis that we must approach our evaluation of the speeches that we have heard at this plenum today. Time and the people will put everything in its proper place. They will correct anyone who tries to run ahead, forcing his own ill-conceived opinion on people, and will praise anyone who is able to point out the correct path to resolution of various problems.

"Many of these problems are connected to a greater or a lesser degree with interethnic relations. This, comrades, is a very delicate area of human relations. Here, as Vladimir Ilich said, we 'must be cautious a thousand-fold.' For example, we in the Central Committee Buro repeatedly discussed each thesis of our report before presenting it at a plenum of the LaSSR CP Central Committee. At that plenum we strove sincerely and in a principled manner to analyze many acute problems which have not been spoken of this frankly for a long time. And we not only analyzed them, we also outlined ways of resolving many problems through joint efforts. I would like to mention several of them, so that there will be no need to waste time debating on the basis of misinformation.

"The plenum expressed unanimous support for the efforts of historians, writers and journalists with regard to study and illumination of the most difficult periods in the modern history of our republic. A special authoritative commission was established to analyze the situation which preceded the July 1959 LaSSR CP Central Committee Plenum and the implementation of the decisions made by that plenum. Scientists and party officials face the task of determining definitely whether or not the one-sided views and voluntarism of those years, so typical of the administrative-command style of leadership, were sufficient grounds for accusing several comrades of nationalism. For Vilis Kruminsh, Karlis Ozolinsh, Aleksandr Nikonov, Pavel Pizans, Voldemar Kalpinsh and Pauls Dzerve were in the front ranks of those fighting to establish Soviet power during the war and the years of reconstruction; their subsequent work in the party also proved their devotion to socialism. This is not a simple task, and it would be foolish to rush the completion of it.

"A commission has also been established under the republic Council of Ministers for the purpose of reviewing the cases of citizens deported from Latvia during the 1940's. I am aware that writers are assisting that commission actively. And that is good. It is our party and civic duty to rehabilitate those who in the past were the victims of groundless political accusations and illegal actions. This was declared authoritatively by the Central Committee at its plenum, and we will see that it is carried out.

"A broad program of measures has been outlined for the purpose of developing and realizing in practice Latvian-Russian bilingualism. Some work has already been done. There has been improvement in the teaching of Latvian at schools and VUZs, there has been some growth in the number of instructors trained, there is a growing number of language circles where Latvian is studied, and specific instructions have been issued to the heads of sectors concerned with public service, directing them to make bilingualism a reality at enterprises involved in trade, consumer services, communications, public transportation, health care, justice and social security.

"The most important goal of this work is to awaken in each citizen of our republic a desire to study languages and to create all the necessary conditions for realizing that desire. We hope that writers and poets will go beyond merely holding language festivals and will participate even more actively in the development of Latvian-Russian bilingualism and in efforts to familiarize all the citizens of our republic with Latvian culture.

"Quite a few other opinions regarding language policy have also been expressed in today's discussion. The question of a state language was also raised. This is not a new question. In this connection it would be appropriate to recall that even prior to the October Revolution some Social Democrats deemed it expedient to keep a single mandatory state language throughout the country, alleging that it would make organizational and educational work among working people easier. But V. I. Lenin opposed this idea, seeing elements of coercion therein.

"However, we should also note another fact, and that is that merely proclaiming the principle of language equality is not enough. That principle must actually be put into practice. Recall Ilich's political testament. In it he notes: '...we must introduce the strictest rules with regard to the use of national languages in the republics of other nationalities which form our Union, and examine those rules with particular care... In this respect we need a detailed code which could only be compiled with any degree of success by members of the nationality living in a given republic.'

"I think that the search for the optimum ways of regulating the language realm can and should lead in this direction. That is the prerogative of our legislators.

Excessive haste in resolving these matters is impermissible. Also intolerable is excessive bureaucracy or coercion to make people study languages. No one ever won people over using those methods.

"How many just and wrathful words have been spoken recently concerning those imperative-coercive methods! They have also been justly criticized by many speakers here today.

"We are saying an ever firmer 'no!' to imperative forms in the organization of our public lives.

"Should we get sidetracked into bureaucratic methods when the subject is languages and culture of interethnic relations? Is it right to speak in this delicate area of things that are "mandatory" or "required"? I feel that instead of requiring we need to be creating proper conditions. That is where we should focus our efforts. That is how the task was formulated at the LaSSR CP Central Committee plenum, and we should do whatever is necessary to perform it.

"Now permit me to say a few words about the discussion concerning schools with dual languages of instruction. Zigmund Skuinsh has expressed his concern on this point in the press. It was also the subject of speeches at the party plenum.

"I think that it would be an oversimplification to regard the thesis concerning the need to strengthen and develop the network of joint-instruction preschool facilities and schools as an order from on high to carry out an indiscriminate reorganization and reformation of existing schools.

"In our discussion of this at the plenum we bore in mind that educational organs and our pedagogical scientists will study our accumulated experience with such schools, will analyze problems and will help resolve those problems.

"Thus, there is no coercion involved in the resolution of this matter now, nor will there be in the future.

"Jumping the gun, bureaucratic methods and hastiness will not serve anyone's interests with regard to realization of measures designed to curb migration, either. Our attitude toward migration is that bans alone will not solve the problem. We need unified economic, legal and administrative-organizational measures. It is precisely from this position that we are approaching the drafting of a joint resolution by the LaSSR CP Central Committee, the republic Council of Ministers and the Latvian Trade Union Council concerning measures to regulate migration-induced population growth in the LaSSR. That resolution will be adopted in the near future and will aid in the solution of many social problems.

"There is also a role for the literary profession to play in the implementation of this resolution. Its words can accomplish much with regard to forming workers' dynasties and increasing the prestige of those professions in which we have a great shortage of workers.

"Speaking at the LaSSR CP Central Committee plenum, Regina Ezera, a people's writer from our republic, said: 'The heaps of nationalities problems which have been avoided all these many years cannot be done away with merely through language study and cultural exchange; what is needed is intelligent and enthusiastic study of reality and energetic steps to normalize the demographic situation... Glasnost has torn away the decorative bandages concealing social ulcers; now is our last chance to heal the patient, instead of just being horrified by the symptoms of the disease...'

"Regina Ezera is to a great extent correct—at the present stage it is essential that we look very seriously at problems with the party's nationalities policy. In all its aspects, both theoretical and practical. It is essential that we work more energetically to resolve economic, social and demographic problems. The efforts of party, soviet and economic organs today are oriented in that direction.

"The LaSSR CP Central Committee has launched an initiative to discuss seriously the fundamental problems of nationalities policy at the 19th All-Union Party Conference. We have already sent a number of proposals to Moscow. Among them are proposals calling for a substantial increase in the independence of union republics, mandatory consideration of national interests when any social or economic development problem is resolved, establishment of an all-union research institute to study national processes in our country and publication of a corresponding sociopolitical journal, as well as a number of other proposals.

"It is our opinion that we must reevaluate in a fundamental manner the role of central and local organs of state authority with regard to resolution of matters pertaining to interethnic relations and with regard to more complete consideration of the interests of all ethnic groups.

"At the same time the Central Committee plenum emphasized that there are a number of issues which we can and should resolve without waiting for implementation of new ideas and approaches at the all-union level. For example, a great deal can be done to improve the ecological situation in our republic. Much has been said on that subject here today, and rightly so. But words are not enough; what we need is action.

"In this regard we should all support the efforts of the recently established State Committee for the Protection of Nature, the Latvian Cultural Fund and other public

groups, and we should do everything possible to ensure that our descendants will be able to take pride in the Daugava River, Sigulda and Yurmala, in every corner of our republic.

"We have without a doubt awakened in people a desire to live better. That is good. But it is no less important to awaken a desire to work better, to be proprietors in the noblest sense of that word.

"We have succeeded in demonstrating to people the advantages of democracy and glasnost. Now it is essential that we provide all the necessary conditions for deepening those processes. The first steps have already been taken in that direction. We have drawn up a new administrative diagram and made a substantial reduction in the number of ministries and departments; persistent reduction in the size of the administrative apparatus and delineation of the functions of party and soviet organs are underway. Our creative unions can also make an important contribution in this work. As you are aware, a State Committee for Culture is in the process of being established. And businesslike suggestions by creative workers concerning its structure, functions and cadres will definitely be taken into consideration.

"Comrades! We are faced with an ever greater number of tasks and problems. That is quite natural. We are becoming ever more aware of the complexity and the many aspects of restructuring. The time has come when the people are expecting not just more meetings and promises, but also concrete actions and concrete results.

"Some people have not yet grasped this. And that creates a situation in which there are often more people making suggestions, advising and tutoring than there are people doing their jobs and taking full responsibility for what they say. Yet it is precisely responsibility which today marks and tomorrow will continue to mark the boundary that separates true fighters for restructuring from the phonies. The boundary that will separate the genuine proponents of restructuring—no matter how harsh their words or actions may be at times—from the demagogues and big talkers who seek only advancement of their own ambitions through democracy.

"This demarcation is not to everyone's liking. There are people who would like to set the people against the party, the republic against the country, who would like to incite conflict between them, who would like to discredit our leaders, placing on them the blame for all mistakes, past and present. This is at the very least incorrect. In my opinion the opinion expressed recently by the chairman of the board of the LaSSR Writers' Union, Yanis Peters, falls closer to the truth. He correctly stated that there are different kinds of party workers and different kinds of creative workers. They behaved in various ways during the period of stagnation. They also approach shortcomings in differing ways today. Some tolerate shortcomings, while others struggle resolutely to promote restructuring.

"I think that it is profoundly wrong to divide society up into those who provide the ideas and those who are supposed to carry them out. We are all responsible to the people for restructuring, and the people have a right to demand an accounting from each one of us, regardless of the post we may occupy in the party or in our creative union.

"At a recent party plenum at which an account by the LaSSR CP Central Committee Buro was presented, the Buro honestly and frankly admitted that there are a great many shortcomings and much formalism in our work. We are especially concerned by conservatism, and we are working persistently to overcome old approaches and learn how to work in a new way.

"We are all well aware that restructuring in our country was initiated by and is being guided by the party. This fact places a special responsibility on each communist. There is no way for us to avoid that responsibility. However, we must not forget the responsibility of the intelligentsia, either. People have faith in the intelligentsia, and this demands a sober, responsible approach on the part of its members toward everything that they say and every appeal that they make.

"The working people of our republic have a right to count on self-critical evaluation on the part of the boards of creative unions as well.

"The LaSSR CP Central Committee realizes that the cultural realm should be the object of our special attention. It is essential that we overcome the negative effects of the so-called 'leftover principle' in this area as soon as possible. During the period of stagnation that principle was manifested not only through a slackening of attention to reinforcement of the material and technical base of cultural institutions, but also through underestimation of the role of literature and the arts in the functioning of our society.

"We are turning to face the individual and are becoming ever more aware that it is the individual's activism, initiative and cultural and professional level that will in the final analysis decide the fate of restructuring. And literature and the arts are one of the most important factors in the molding of a creative attitude toward one's labor and public activities.

"That is why it is so important that we speed up the development of culture, raising it to a higher level. A number of measures have already been adopted toward this end. The Culture 2000 Program is currently being developed. But this is not enough. We need a clear-cut long-range concept for the development not only of the physical base, but also of the entire cultural realm. In this respect it is creative unions that have the most to say. Perhaps even at this plenum it would be worthwhile to think about establishing a working group that will take on this mission and concern itself with the development

of a concept that would give the fullest possible consideration to growth in the people's spiritual needs and the interests of all creative unions with regard to development of national culture.

"Today it is also clear that the capabilities of the state alone will not suffice to realize all proposals pertaining to the development of culture. We must also get labor collectives and the general public more broadly involved with these problems.

"In order to accelerate valid cultural development we also need new approaches to leadership in that realm. We must self-critically acknowledge that many party and soviet workers seem to have forgotten Lenin's fundamental idea concerning the principles, methods and forms of party work with the creative intelligentsia, preferring instead to issue orders to writers and artists. If we are going to renounce command-bureaucratic methods in the economy, then they are even less acceptable in the cultural realm.

"Democratic principles, confidence in talent, tolerance of the unaccustomed, of seeking, competence, goodwill and encouragement of initiative and innovation: these are the key principles of party work in cultural matters, the principles which are our weapons and to which we will constantly adhere.

"The party's Central Committee favors democratization of all cultural life, democratization of its forms and content, diversity of means of self-expression and socialist pluralism of opinion. We quite naturally expect that creative unions will take a tolerant attitude toward artistic diversity, and that the interests of the group will not predominate in evaluations of a given work of literature or the arts. The forces of creative workers must be utilized to accelerate restructuring, but in no case must they be used to influence the development of intra-group relationships.

"We must always take into account the fact that it is our creative intelligentsia that senses the changes in and moods of society sooner than anyone else. It provides the party and society with highly valuable social information. Communists have an obligation to listen to its voice and react to that voice in a timely manner. Therein lies the larger sense of the role of culture in the party's ideological work. I think that today it is correct to conclude that party and creative workers must meet much more frequently, not just at plenums, but also in the course of their jobs, they must debate and together seek ways of resolving acute problems.

"And there are quite a few such problems in industry and agriculture, in the social sphere and in the cultural realm. Many of them have been accumulating for years and could not be solved in a matter of days no matter how much we might want to.

"We are all dissatisfied with the current rate of development of many sectors, and the Central Committee Buro is seeking ways to improve more markedly the living standards of our republic's working people.

"It is especially important that we make faster economic progress. For the economy is the foundation, and upon its condition depends the realization of our plans in the social and cultural realm.

"We regard increased production efficiency, improvement of the administrative and managerial mechanism and reinforcement of social justice as the most correct means of resolving many problems.

"These are the objectives of the draft concept of the LaSSR's economic and social development up to the year 2005. This draft has already been considered by the Central Committee Buro, and significant comments have been made. After its drafting is complete it will be submitted for public discussion.

"We hope that creative workers will participate most actively in that discussion. This will permit us to take into consideration more fully all the wants and needs of working people.

"In conclusion allow me to wish the members of our republic intelligentsia creative successes and more positive deeds for the benefit of our people!"

An information report on the evening session of 1 June and the plenum meetings of 2 June will be published in the press, along with a general account of the plenum's work.

Selected Speeches at Plenum

18000450 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
10 Jun 88 pp 1-4

[Report on speeches given at plenum of LaSSR Writers' Union, 1-2 June 1988: "Thinking In Unison, Acting In Unison"]

[Text] As has already been reported, on 1-2 June a plenum of the LaSSR Writers' Union was held, with the heads of the other creative unions and other experts attending. In an atmosphere of complete openness and frankness a number of problems extending far beyond the bounds of creative organizations' purely professional concerns were discussed; professional matters actually received the least attention of all. Instead, attention focused on a broad range of social, economic and political issues. Everything about the plenum confirmed our republic intelligentsia's high degree of interest in the development of restructuring processes and their involvement in the results of restructuring; the majority of ideas and suggestions aired during the two days of the plenum were connected in one way or another with the agenda of the upcoming 19th All-Union Party Conference.

In view of this it was only logical that the plenum would be addressed by party officials, scientists, engineers, physicians, administrators and jurists in addition to writers, artists, cinematographers, designers, architects, journalists, musicians and theatrical workers. Perhaps the only ones left out of this list of professions are blue-collar workers and kolkhoz members.

Almost 70 individuals spoke, taking advantage of all the opportunities offered by democratic procedure. At a rough estimate it would take about 10 issues of a newspaper like CINA or SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA for us to print the texts of all the speeches, many of which did not stick to any restrictions on length. Among the suggestions made at the plenum was the idea that a separate brochure on the plenum be published. However, the accounting given below does contain, although in an abridged form, all the most significant opinions, evaluations, conclusions and recommendations and takes pluralism into account.

Obviously we cannot accept all the speeches equally. For a speech by a single speaker can contain both a constructive approach and a simple outburst of emotion, or one-sidedness on subjects which are complex and sensitive. Nonetheless, we would like to stress the most important point: despite all the harshness, and at times the mercilessness, of the criticism heard at the plenum, all the criticism was of a constructive nature. This was noted by B. K. Pugo, first secretary of the LaSSR CP Central Committee, in his speech to the plenum. "We regard today's plenum," he said, "as a continuation of the businesslike and principled discussion of the most important ideological problems of culture which began at the May LaSSR CP Central Committee Plenum, as an expression of the desire of our intelligentsia to make a greater contribution toward acceleration of restructuring." (The complete text of Pugo's speech was published in the republic press on 2 June.)

The Economy: The Starting Point for Everything

We have created some strange stereotypes. Writers, artists and journalists are correctly included in the category of creative intelligentsia. But what about planners and economists? One has to stop and think a long time before answering that question. Whereas a publicist is personally responsible for his every fact and can even be held liable in court, a planner who makes an erroneous, socially harmful decision can easily avoid the same fate. Also strange, is it not?

This demarcation between spheres of creative and non-creative work is not the only convention, not the only stereotype. M. Ya. Lemeshev, UN environmental expert, based his speech on refutation of a number of divergent opinions. Incidentally, reports by two Moscow doctors of sciences and by O. R. Latsis, first deputy editor-in-chief of the journal KOMMUNIST, expanded our view of our republic economy.

"For years now we have proclaimed," said M. Ya. Lemeshev, "that our main objective is to increase the prosperity of society, of everyone and of each individual. But what does prosperity mean? We have had it drilled into us that it is equivalent to increasing material consumption. If we have a one-room apartment that is bad; if we have a four-room apartment or a house of our own, then that is good. If we ride the streetcar that is bad, but if we have our own car then that is good. If we consume 60 kilograms of meat per capita, as the USSR Central Statistical Administration tells us we do, then that is bad, but if we start eating 85 kilograms then that would be good. In fact, this is a purely utilitarian concept of prosperity. In order for society to develop it must first of all develop spiritually, so that the labor of each person is conscientious and creative. In our efforts to increase our material wealth we have forgotten that prosperity consists not only of an assortment of material things, but also includes a spiritual component, which is somewhat more important. We attempt to compensate for a lack of creativity in labor by providing material incentives. This approach results from violations of socialist attitudes toward property. The root of our problem of inefficient public production lies in the fact that our concept of public property has become skewed. We no longer have public property—it has become departmental property. All our wealth—natural resources, fixed capital, capital investment funds, financial and labor resources—has been turned over to the departments. And this causes us to have rapid growth of physical production. At one time we had the slogan: 'Catch up with and surpass the capitalist countries in terms of industrial production growth.' We have accomplished that. We have far surpassed all the developed capitalist countries, including the United States, with respect to production of oil, natural gas, steel, iron ore, machine tools, tractors, cement... Basically we are ahead of the entire planet according to every index.

"But what has happened to our main objective: improvement in the well-being of society? Our national income is only 66 percent that of the United States, despite having overtaken that country in terms of production growth. If we take into account the fact that our population is 285 million, and theirs 240 million, then our per capita income is even less. If we take into account the fact that the United States of America spends only 15 percent on extended reproduction of capital, while we spend 28 percent, then our consumption fund per capita is only 43 percent of theirs, in spite of our gigantic advantage in terms of production growth rates.

"Production growth rates are the main destructive force both with regard to nature and the economy. They are the source of all our problems. Despite the fact that we have such tremendous production growth rates we still have shortages of everything.

"The idea that shortages can be overcome by increasing the growth rate of production is profoundly wrong. Production shortfalls cannot be eliminated without

changing the production structure. Our heavy industry, planned by the departments, is working only for itself.

"Following the theory of reproduction we have up until now falsely reckoned that in order for public production to develop it is essential that the means of production grow much more rapidly than the rate of consumer goods production. And thereby we have arrived at a dead end. If we examine the structure of public production we find that there are no shortages. Neither of metal, nor of energy, nor of other materials. This is a case of us strangling ourselves and strangling nature. We need a program designed to sharply curtail production in all the nature-exploiting sectors. But the ministries and departments will never do this. Because they have a function: to produce their sector's goods. They receive the people's resources for that purpose. If they succeed in consuming those resources they win prizes, wages, titles, medals and other bonuses. What can oppose the dictates of the departments? Only one thing: Soviet power, on the condition that we give it back its resources and restore its economic might."

G. K. Asaris, chief architect of the city of Riga, convincingly illustrated the dictates of the departments. In June 1981 an all-union resolution was adopted—and still remains in effect—regarding limitations on the construction of industrial facilities in large cities. This document forbade the construction or expansion of industrial facilities in Riga and Yurmala, and put limitations on such activities in Liepaya. In spite of this, directives were issued at various levels during the period from July 1981 to December 1987 providing for the expansion of almost 100 different plants in Riga, or for new construction projects (including the Riga Railway Car Plant, the Riga State Electrotechnical Plant, the Diesel Motor Building Plant, Rigaselmash, Sarkana zvaigzne, Kompressor, Alfa, Pirmays mays, Kommutator, the Riga Electrical Machine Building Plant and others). In Liepaya the Sarkanays metalurgs Plant, Liepayselmash and the Liepaya Linoleum Plant underwent expansion. In many of these cases the opinions of local soviets were either not taken into consideration or were not sought at all.

This topic was also broached in other speeches. One speaker cited the following fact: in 1972 an inventory of fixed capital was conducted in our republic. The plan was to determine its status and draw up a plan for the social and economic development of enterprises over the next 10 years. By 1982 all the main projects should have been built, equipped and given a long-range plan. Now, wonder of wonders, when we talk about reconstruction we get a mass of complaints about the neglected basis, which has not been worked on in 20-30 years. For the administrators of many enterprises demanding a new base is to follow the sheep principle: when one spot of grass has been eaten up the sheep move on to another.

When major projects are constructed within the republic by all-union specialized institutes this is often done without adequate consultation of republic specialists on the matter and without listening to public opinion, G. K. Asaris also noted in his speech.

Thus, all-union institutes have already drawn up the documentation on the Skaystkalne Gypsum Quarry, one of the largest quarries in the Northwestern Economic Region of our country, with a capacity of 450,000 metric tons of gypsum per year. But even that did not seem enough for the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, so at the beginning of this year, with the support of USSR Gosstroy and the consent of our republic Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, the decision was made to double the quarry's capacity, in order to provide enough gypsum to supply cement production enterprises in Lithuania, Estonia and the Russian Federation, leaving us only 17 percent of the total (to supply the Brotseny and Suriyeshskiy combines). The creation of such a huge quarry, one of interrepublic significance, in direct proximity to the Vetsumniyeki-Skaystkalne Highway is hardly justifiable, either socially or ecologically. There should also be comprehensive discussion of the planned construction of the Yekabpils Hydroelectric Power Station.

The idea of making public expert opinions on planned projects was also brought up in the speech by O. R. Latsis. He stressed the need for democratic, genuine discussion by the Supreme Soviet not only of the state budget as a whole, but also of major construction projects on an individual basis. Because when the departments built a new combine in Ogre the old Ogre was no more; it seemed to have become a different city. Concern at the lack of glasnost when major decisions are made was also expressed by O. D. Potreki, secretary of the party committee of the Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka. Similarly, the new chart of the sectorial administrative structure is being compiled without consultation of either the public or scientists; everything is shrouded in mystery. Remarking that in our republic everyone uses the land, water and air any way he or she pleases, Potreki noted that our republic should have a monopoly on the land as on any other economic facility. That is the only way we can oppose the construction of industrial giants. We need legal guarantees that will protect the rights of republics. We need cost-accounting at all levels within the framework of a unified nationwide economic complex and economic independence, noted other speakers.

Thus, Ya. P. Poriyetis, doctor of economic sciences, said that Estonian scientists are already working on proposals for the gradual introduction of cost-accounting on a republic-wide scale, which would be in line with the strategy of economic intensification. When we consider this it is essential that we first of all develop a well-designed concept of our republic's scientific-technical and social progress. Secondly, toward this end it is essential that we gradually create a system of mutually advantageous equivalent exchange of goods and services between individual regions; this will also help strengthen cost-accounting at individual enterprises. Thirdly, we must create a more effective and more rational mechanism for the protection and utilization of the environment. Poriyetis also cited the example of the intensive

development model that has been consistently implemented by the GDR. During the 1960-1986 period that country, despite negative population growth in some of those years and virtually without recourse to external manpower resources, increased per capita national income by a factor of 3.3; this was achieved through strict resource conservation measures and a well-designed plan of scientific-technical progress. Simultaneously the GDR has also dealt successfully with problems of social development. But in order to manage our economy in a more rational manner, commented Professor I. A. Strautmanis, head of the Department of Architecture and City Planning at the Riga Polytechnical Institute, we must distribute national income more fairly, otherwise we will not improve the quality of the spatial environment and will not improve our city-planning policy.

When M. L. Raman, chairman of LaSSR Gosplan, took the floor a majority of plenum participants hoped to hear an honest, frank reply to many of the questions that had been raised. Including a question from A. Ya. Kletskin, movie critic and senior instructor in the Journalism Department of the Philological Department of Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka: "How did it happen that Latvia, which was the most highly developed of the Baltic republics, not to mention more developed than Belorussia, which was completely destroyed in the war, is today in last place among those republics according to a number of indices? Is the center also chiefly responsible for this?"

M. L. Raman began by comparing the two days of the plenum to a thunderstorm, which causes harm although sometimes it can also do good. Then he shared his conclusion that during the period before glasnost much that the republic government did remained unpublicized. Thus, as early as 1967 the idea was put forth that the entire social realm should be financed by a standardized system of deductions from national income. But at that time the all-union departments did not support that idea. Now, in the 1989-90 period, our republic will make a transition to financing of that realm with the aid of deductions from the profits of other classes of income, and starting with the 13th Five-Year Plan with a standard amount drawn from national income.

"At the beginning of the 1970's we were the first among the union republics," he said, "to take a survey of all residents who received apartments in 1971. On the basis of that survey the Council of Ministers passed a resolution directing that the situation be given consideration. Unfortunately, it was not." M. L. Raman noted the positive role played by setting limits on the number of persons employed in industry. Referring to the dictates of the departments, he reported that two years ago a letter was sent to the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers regarding the postponement of the construction of a number of facilities to the more

distant future. Projects to reconstruct and expand eight enterprises were successfully put off. Currently new proposals are being drawn up on this matter.

Regarding the construction of an atomic electric power station he gave assurances that no decision has been made yet. Yes, the Ministry of Power and Electrification has brought up the matter. Our Institute of Physics and Power Engineering is now studying the possibility of an alternative model.

Villages: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow

A group of experts and other speakers analyzed the situation in the field of agriculture, which has traditionally played a leading role in our republic's economic complex.

"We scientists are receiving a large number of letters expressing concern at the slow rate of agricultural development in our republic," said E. Ya. Grinovskis, professor at the Latvian Agricultural Academy, as he began his speech. Then he went on to say: "Even during the years of stagnation I wrote an article on this topic which I submitted to the magazine KAROGS. But it was rejected as false, incorrect and unacceptable to the people. I would like to cite a number of ideas contained in that article here today, so that analysis of the past can serve as the basis for projection of the future, so that we can avoid repeating past mistakes.

"How far has our agricultural system come today in comparison to the past? In this regard Comrade Drizul stated that we achieved our prewar level sometime during the 1960's. I object to that statement; he is portraying reality in much rosier shades than is actually the case.

"Firstly, when we refer to our prewar level we generally select the level of the year 1940. But I do not use that year as a basis for comparison. Much data for that year is not supported with documentary evidence today, thus in many instances we must depend on the statements of contemporaries of that time. I happened to work in the same department with people who were in charge of agriculture at that time and on the basis of their information I can state that the 1940 data are not objective; they were underestimated so that a great increase in agricultural production in 1941 could be demonstrated. Though I do not have official confirmation of this, I am nevertheless convinced that production volume actually decreased by 16 percent. Therefore I use 1938 as my basis for comparison. Using that year we achieved our prewar level much later; if the 1938 level was 100, then the 1987 agricultural production volume was 142. This is a very modest growth rate. In comparison to the other union republics over the same time period we are in last place in terms of agricultural production growth rates. We have barely exceeded the per capita production

volume of 1938. This means that the number of citizens, which has risen mainly as a result of immigration, has increased faster than our volume of agricultural production.

"If we compare the republics of the Baltic region during the same period we get the following ranking: Belorussia, closely followed by Lithuania, then Estonia and Latvia. But we must also take into account the fact that in the past the level of agricultural development in Lithuania and Belorussia was low; that means that the absolute value of one percent of growth was less. Therefore another index is of importance: absolute increase in production per land unit. If that index is applied the ranking looks like this: Estonia, Lithuania, Belorussia and Latvia. Why do we come out last?

"In our neighboring republics the laws of economics were followed more consistently than here, and there was less subjectivism and voluntarism. Ignoring the laws of economics leads to the following consequences: declining rates of development, increasing disproportions and imbalance, and declining production efficiency.

"Now for some specific examples. We have overestimated the advantages of economic concentration. We have created large farms, eliminating small dairies, retail outlets and other enterprises which could have added luster to their respective departments' financial indices. We have not been sufficiently consistent in our attitude toward the individual sector, veering from one extreme to the other. But our neighbors were somewhat more farsighted. We forced our kolkhoz members to give up their private farm plots. Furthermore, we did so through administrative methods. Now we are trying to revive the individual sector.

"Now we are going to another extreme, letting the individual sector take on hypertrophic forms at some farms. If we pose directly the question of which people in rural areas are better off in a material sense, then the answer is a kolkhoz member on a declining farm.

"We have persisted in searching for some individual measure rather than developing agriculture in a comprehensive fashion. I am referring to the numerous campaigns, from the peat-and-compost campaign to the present rape-cultivation campaign. And, finally, there is one other factor: in the neighboring republics the level of farm independence was somewhat greater than here.

"The modest rate of our agricultural development can to a large extent be ascribed to the fact that in our republic there has occurred and continues to occur an intensive polarization of farms; there is increasing differentiation in their economic levels. Latvia's agriculture is the most polarized in the country. At the rayon level within our republic the sharpest differences are among farms in Salduskiy and Bauskiy rayons, and the least differences are observable in Limbazhskiy Rayon.

"Polarization has appeared not only in the economy, but also in people's minds, in their way of thinking. The heads of strong farms act boldly and fearlessly. At the Agricultural Academy I am in charge of advanced training courses, and in the breaks between classes I observe how micro-collectives form according to farms' relative economic strength. A strong farm director has almost nothing to say to the chairman of a weak farm. Their interests are too divergent. The one is thinking about opening a branch in the FRG, the other is wondering how he is going to repair a cowshed.

"I will list the factors involved in polarization. The first and most decisive is intellectual potential, i.e. the competence, erudition, experience and organizational skills of the farm's head and chief specialists. Strong farms are headed by individuals with an innate flair for organization. This talent cannot be taught, it must be a natural gift. At farms with great intellectual potential there is also a hidden aspect: the well-developed informal ties which are often of greater significance when it comes to distributing funds than are plans setting funding limits.

"The second factor is private farm plots. In those places where they are well developed there are supplementary means of intensifying agriculture, developing the social sphere and attracting workers. The third factor is the structure of sectors, because under our current pricing system there are advantageous and disadvantageous sectors. The fourth factor is land appraisal. And the fifth factor is the location of farms, because we are undergoing an intensive process of hidden urbanization. A peasant remains in his village yet moves closer to the city, closer to Riga, as a result of which in Latvia today there are 15-16 hectares of cultivated land per worker, but in Rizhskiy Rayon this figure is only three hectares. And there are currently more Latgals working in Rizhskiy Rayon than there are remaining in their native region. The Padomju Latvija Agricultural Complex has the best supply of workers—there there is one worker per hectare, just like in China.

"Hypertrophic development of industry is a major problem in our republic. We hold first place in the USSR in terms of per capita production of industrial goods. We have built many enterprises for which our republic had neither the raw materials, energy, labor resources or markets. At the same time we have failed to build plants that are urgently needed for rural development. Not even plants for the production of construction materials or for the processing of agricultural products. And as a result we face a multitude of problems.

"Today we need greater glasnost and more information concerning what and how much we are receiving from other republics and what we are sending them.

"We are proud of our republic's high level of meat consumption, 86 kilograms per capita of carcass weight, whereas the scientifically based nationwide consumption norm is 82 kilograms. That is to say, we have more than

we supposedly need. But what does carcass weight mean? It means muscles, fat, byproducts and bones. And the proportions of these four components are not the same in our republic's markets, which supply local needs, and in the centralized supplies. Therefore the figure 86 is perhaps correct in the narrow mathematical sense, but it has no economic significance.

"In agriculture we have not yet fully developed the economic mechanism; this often causes distortions in the orientation of interests. The division of farms into four groups on the basis of their economic potential with a corresponding price differentiation and subsidies paid to the weaker farms creates a false orientation of interests, and gives farms no incentive to intensify their production. Because by doing so they would cause themselves to be placed in a different group where procurement prices are lower. What we are seeing is a competition among the heads of farms to be classed in the lowest group. Thus, a new chief with good connections arrived at the Draudziba Kolkhoz in Salduskiy Rayon. And he arranged it so that that farm was put in a group one category lower. Now it receives several hundred thousand rubles more for the same volume of production."

Ervid Yanovich stressed that as small homesteads have been eliminated on farms, especially major ones, a kind of metropolitan area and a periphery as well have come into being. The intensity and culture of production decline as distance from the center increases. In this connection we cite data given in a speech by another expert (Ya. P. Poriyets): surveys taken at the beginning of the 1970's in all the rayons of our republic indicated that 78 percent of rural residents surveyed wanted to live in single-family dwellings, six percent wanted to live in one- or two-story apartment houses, and only 16 percent wanted to live in multistory apartment buildings of the sectional type. Unfortunately, the results of this study have not always been taken into account.

But let us return to the professor's speech:

"The process of elimination of small homesteads," he said, "was not spontaneous, but rather a planned action. The theoretical basis of this campaign was developed by planners and land resource specialists, and it was pushed through using administrative methods."

Speaking of the reasons behind problems in agriculture, E. Ya. Grinovskis agreed with the opinion of A. A. Drizul that a great deal of harm was done by overly hasty collectivization. Academician A. A. Drizul noted that during the process of universal collectivization of the country a mechanism of terror and lawlessness was developed, and those same methods were applied in Latvia as well. Yet everyone knows how rich was the cooperative tradition in our republic. That tradition should have been combined with socialism, as Lenin had instructed. But under concrete historical conditions this was not done. As a result of Stalinist collectivization agriculture was virtually destroyed.

The time has come to officially declare that action illegal, said E. Ya. Grinovskis. He disagreed with the treatments of some of the historians of our republic who are of the opinion that this was an objectively necessary and legitimate act, that it was what was required by the logic of the class struggle, with only a couple of excesses being committed. If this was so, the professor continued, then today a farm like Lachpleis should be the poorest of the poor, since that was where all the "enemies of the people" stayed and still continue to work. Yet on the contrary it is at Islitse in Bauskiy Rayon and some other farms, which are now virtually empty, that there remain and continue to work people who cannot be called anything but inter-farm and inter-republic vagabonds. The concept of Dzerve, Treys and other concerning the development of our republic put forward by them in the late 1950's was objectively true. Now we are returning to that concept. We must give these individuals back their good reputations, said Grinovskis in conclusion.

Any process of development is an ongoing process. The shape of today was decided by the events of the past. The aforementioned scientist's conclusions and observations coincided to a great extent with those expressed in a speech by Ya. P. Lutsans, chairman of the board of the Komunars Agricultural Combine. In particular, he noted that several years ago a decision was made to develop the infrastructure of lagging farms. The resolution envisioned the use of state funds to build on those farms the schools, kindergartens, cultural facilities and apartments which the farms themselves had ruined, in order to once again be able to attract people and restore the rhythm of production. As we make the transition to self-financing this resolution has been forgotten, and now those farms which did not have time to complete the facilities they need—and there are many such farms—are doomed to continued vegetation and bankruptcy. They will be forced to run up debts in the millions in order to build the essentials. "I do not know," he said, "whether a subway is needed or not, but I do know that every state needs a normally developed agricultural system. It is precisely in our republic that agriculture could become that sector which would yield very good results, if it were properly developed." Referring to existing disproportions, Lutsans cited the following figures: 12,000 single-family homes are built in Lithuanian villages each year, yet in Latvia only about 2,000 such homes are built annually. Can it be that Latvians do not want to build them? They do, but the problems connected with obtaining building materials are so great that it is a rare individual who is willing to go to that much trouble. We have no bricks, cement, gas concrete, slate or plumbing, yet we are drawing up the Housing 2000 Program. "I do not know," said Lutsans, "whether there is a similar program in Lithuania, but we are purchasing building materials from Lithuania and Estonia. Recently they have been unwilling to sell us any more. Would it thus perhaps be expedient for us to develop our own building materials industry?" Today the way is open to personal initiative. However, over time there is appearing a

disparity between the genuine and understandable decisions at the highest level and the evasive, slow actions in our republic and its rayons. More than one progressive initiative has been slowed down in this manner in the past. Today the only tangible expression of activism in our republic is the fuss being made about the reorganization and name changes taking place in certain departments, including agriculture, for the umpteenth time. Such changes as these are familiar to us; they have never yielded anything, and they will not yield anything this time, either. When we talk about agriculture we do not need to be talking about how best to administer it, but rather about what needs to be done in order to make it produce more.

Time To Repay Debts

Plenum participants also focused attention on the very timely issues of demography, health care and ecology.

In many parts of our republic the state of the environment is causing great concern on the part of specialists, the public, local residents and party and soviet leaders. For many years we have only striven, to use a trite phrase, to conquer nature, essentially ravaging it without properly tending its wounds. Now we are being repaid with rivers, air and soil that are polluted beyond all measure. Realization of looming ecological catastrophe has come too late. Otherwise we would not have to acknowledge that Riga with its almost one million inhabitants does not have enough water-treatment facilities, or that the Gulf of Riga in the area of Yurmala is being increasingly transformed into a cesspool, or that we are experiencing more and more ecological disasters like the one in Olayne.

"And in Ventspils," added A. A. Didrikhson, that city's chief architect, not without justification.

It would seem that the residents of that seaside city should be in high spirits; the 700th anniversary of the founding of Vetspils is not far off. Yet they are not particularly overjoyed, for they are living on a volcano. A catastrophe could occur at any moment. And that is no exaggeration. Just two or three kilometers from the center of the city, which has a population in excess of 50,000, there are storage tanks and pipelines filled with ammonia, methane, nitrile, gasoline, petroleum and other hazardous chemicals for which a residential area is a less than optimum storage and transshipment location.

Speakers declared that the program set forth in Moscow to normalize the ecological situation in Ventspils will not improve the situation. The only solution is to gradually remove ecologically hazardous enterprises from the city. This was also the conclusion reached by a Latvian commission of experts. Yet this opinion is not even being considered. On the contrary, new attacks have been launched on Ventspils by the central departments, USSR Gosplan and the USSR Council of Ministers. They are pretending that there is no danger. Ministry

officials cheerily draw up their resolution, using language like "In the exceptional event that...", "on the condition that..." etc., ignoring decisions agreed upon previously with regard to normalization of the ecological situation.

Similar pressure from above, including pressure on the republic government, also occurs, for example, in cases involving the loading and unloading in our port of powdered caustic soda originating in the Urals. Doing so was banned as of the end of last year. However, the USSR Council of Ministers, citing the need for exports, "puts the squeeze" on the republic government, or else on the leaders of the city and the port. And the dust cloud does not exist, yet there it is on the horizon. Does not this pliancy cost the people of Ventspils too dearly?

Much is required of those to whom much has been given. It was not surprising that P. A. Tsimdinsh, chief of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences Biology Institute Laboratory, speaking in his capacity as an ecological expert, proposed in the conclusion of his speech that work being done by the republic's Council of Ministers and Gosplan to carry out ecological policy be pronounced unsatisfactory. Higher authorities are also obviously to blame for the fact that we obtain raw materials from other regions of the country, yet only 20 percent of those raw materials are actually used to produce goods; the rest end up as wastes which pollute the environment. Furthermore, over 60 percent of our finished products are sold outside of Latvia. This ecologically shortsighted and economically disadvantageous economy cannot go on, noted the expert. He made the following proposals: use our natural resources first and foremost in the interests of our own republic's development; give top priority to the orientations which are in harmony with our region's ecological, geographical, cultural, economic and ethnic characteristics; have our republic's scientists draw up and submit for broad public discussion a draft general concept for the development of Latvia's productive forces; halt the urbanization process; develop research aimed at solving regional ecological problems, including through direct international cooperation with the countries surrounding the Baltic Sea; and eliminate the causes of immigration-induced population growth.

This expert's proposals and appraisals seem fine. Yet there is one point on which we are not in agreement with him. When he cites official data he constantly casts doubt on the veracity of those data, calling them overly optimistic. In their place he confidently bases his conclusions on his own calculations, which were done on the basis of "serious scientific analysis."

Thus, citing the fact that over the past 30 years the in Western Hemisphere the birth of children with birth defects has increased from 3.5 percent to 11.5 percent, he asserts that in our republic this same figure is 20-25 percent. Upon what does the researcher base this conclusion? "Confirmation of this is the large number of schools for handicapped children," he says. This can hardly be regarded as the result of serious scientific analysis.

This is connected with a matter which is truly a reason to reproach statisticians: the continuing classification of certain medical and demographic data as secret. This makes no sense whatsoever.

"For many years now we have been talking about the low birthrate in our republic," said P. A. Eglite, department head at the LaSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics. "In order to achieve full replacement of generations in Latvia it is essential that each family have an average of 2.6 children or more. Since people generally change their place of residence when they are young, and since among the republic's native population elderly people are in the majority, 10 years ago immigration-induced population growth predominated in Latvia. In the 1980's this situation has changed. In the 1985-86 period there were an average of 2.09 children for each female citizen of our republic. I feel that this is the result of various social benefits offered by our state. A certain role was also played by the mass media, which depicted large families more often and analyzed the problems encountered by families with only one child.

"According to data from an all-union sampling married Latvian women aged 18 to 44 had more children than Russian women of the same age group. Nevertheless the Latvian population of our republic continues to shrink. It is indicative that this was observed as early as the 1930's. Natural population growth in Latvia, already low, fell from 3.3 per 1,000 residents in 1970 to 2.8 per 1,000 in 1985.

"However, natural population growth in Lithuania and Belorussia is greater by an average factor of almost two. In those areas purposeful social and economic development have yielded positive results, ensuring the most important thing: replacement of human resources.

"Unfortunately our republic planning organs have not been energetic enough in their resistance to pressure from various departments at the union level, and have not been completely consistent in their efforts to restructure Latvia's economy on an intensive basis of development. In order to improve the situation more opportunities must be provided for improving housing conditions for the people already living in Riga, young families in particular.

"However, the waiting list for apartments has reached a record number: 75,000 families (if we multiply this by the family coefficient of 3.1 this is equal to 200,000 people). In view of this situation it comes as no surprise that many people must wait 20 years to get an apartment—an entire generation."

It was noted at the plenum that our most urgent task today is to bring about a substantial reduction in immigration-induced growth of our republic's population. This type of growth was encouraged during the initial postwar years by the fact that Latvia's economy suffered less from the devastation of war than did that of other

regions of our country, and the standard of living here was higher, and in the 1960's and 1970's by the fact Latvia was experiencing extensive industrial development. That economic policy was carried out without any consideration being given to the local availability of labor resources. Today a decisive role in improving the current situation can be played by more rapid transition to new methods of management, introduction of new types of production at a number of renovated enterprises or the reestablishment of enterprises in other regions which possess all types of resources.

Immigration-induced population growth in our republic, which averaged between 8,000 and 9,000 persons per year in the late 1970's, had increased to 13,800 in 1986 and 18,800 in 1987. However, in their long-range development concept planners envision annual immigration-induced growth of only 2,600 by the year 2005.

It would be socially just to require that those individuals who wish to settle here without special cause pay a certain amount into the state budget. Because when those people settle in Riga they make use of the social infrastructure that was created by the people already living in the city, although the newcomers have not yet given anything to the city. A set fee should also be established for the use of land, this fee to be paid by industrial enterprises that build new facilities, as well as fees for the use of water for industrial purposes, for use of sewer systems and for environmental rehabilitation and protection work done by the appropriate services of the city of Riga. These conditions should gradually be extended to the other cities in our republic where ecological, economic and other problems have become markedly more acute.

This approach will make it possible to begin introducing cost-accounting on a regional scale concurrently with its introduction in sectors and enterprises; this will create a much better economic basis for real expansion of the local soviets' rights.

Currently more than one-third of our republic's population lives in Riga. Yet Kishinev has only 16.1 percent and Vilnius and Minsk 15.5 percent of their respective republics' population. Excessive concentration of our republic's population in Riga, resulting primarily from the immigration-induced growth of that city, is exacerbating its economic, demographic, ecological and cultural problems. In order to solve those problems we need the active support of the entire republic. Enterprises under the jurisdiction of all-union organizations should devote more attention to development of the city's social infrastructure.

Ecology, demography and health are three closely inter-related social realms. If environmental protection is poorly organized certain specific illnesses will increase, said Professor I. R. Lazovski, department head at the Riga Medical Institute, in a speech to the plenum.

Today it is no longer correct to say that the ecological situation is threatening with regard to health. We have already crossed that boundary and are now in the zone of accidents or disasters. Attesting to this is the rise in certain specific illnesses that have been linked to ecological problems. The problem is that our health is not being undermined so much by accidents as it is by the gradual pollution of the environment, pollution which we cannot immediately detect as we eat, breathe or bathe. Independent studies indicate that the levels of nitrates in canned goods in many cases exceed permissible levels by factors of ten. This leads to an increase in cases of cancer and certain types of liver and kidney disease. Unfortunately it must be noted that the data cited in official documents do not always coincide with the data obtained by social activists and individual chemists. The most important way of eliminating this shortcoming is through independent monitoring that will not be under the jurisdiction of either the Ministry of Health or of any other monitoring organizations, which often have an interest in understating the figures obtained.

According to scientific observations in various countries the state of public health depends 90 percent on social, biological and economic conditions, and only 8-10 percent on the health care system. And that is probably not a bad thing, since at this point in time our health care system has more shortcomings than impressive successes. Its most significant shortcoming lies in what is known in plain speech as poverty, or in bureaucratic language as a "poor material-technical base." Today the medical field needs modern equipment. The equipment being produced in this country is imperfect, outdated and in many cases simply non-functional. X-ray technology and equipment for a number of other tests is especially bad, with some of the devices now in use having been invented around the turn of the century. There is a chronic shortage of medicines. The idea was brought up of contracting with an Italian firm to build a one-and-a-half-million-dollar rotary production line which would require only eight workers and would produce 40 million disposable syringes per year. As you are aware, the whole world has been using disposable syringes exclusively for 25 years now while we continue sterilizing our syringes in autoclaves, yet nonetheless we did not receive funding for this project.

There is another problem: centralization and hegemony. Centralization originates at the center, in Moscow, with the high-level medical institutions. Here is a figure to illustrate that: eight percent of our medical scientists work in Moscow, receiving 90 percent of state funding. What is left over for the periphery? Are the people working there less valuable in terms of their potential than those working in the central institutions? Moscow often delays introduction of ideas developed by scientists on the periphery, yet it constantly demands a large number of accounts from the local level, with good indices if possible. Unfortunately this disease has also spread to Latvia. We can see excessive centralization here as well. Local specificity is completely ignored.

Physicians at many clinics do not speak Latvian and cannot converse with patients from the indigenous population in their native language. We have had unpleasant communication failures resulting from the fact that patients did not understand instructions given them by a physician in a language that was foreign to them. Instruction at the Riga Medical Institute should be conducted primarily in Latvian.

"Our Ministry of Health has an excessively large staff," noted I. R. Lazovskiy. "I have visited corresponding ministries abroad and I was amazed that, for example, the English Ministry of Health has only seven staff members, in a country with a population of 56 million; the Austrian Ministry of Health has even fewer, only five staff members and a few secretaries. The apparatus of our republic Ministry of Health is huge, and its primary function is administrative-bureaucratic monitoring. Furthermore, opportunities to express criticism or discuss any matter on initiative from below are becoming more and more circumscribed.

"A tremendous problem in our health care system is window-dressing, efforts by people to prove at any cost that we are the very best. Indeed, it should be acknowledged that our health care system is better than in many other union republics. In any case it is incomparably better than in, say, Turkmenia, Tajikistan or other regions. We regard our large number of physicians as an achievement. We have too many physicians by European standards, and too many positions in hospitals, which are overstaffed. For example, in Switzerland there are twice as many citizens per doctor as there are here. Our number of hospital beds is greater than in any other country. One of the reasons for this is the fact that due to a lack of needed equipment at clinics patients are sent to hospitals to be examined. We have a situation in which in order to take an x-ray of a patient's kidneys or stomach, the patient has to be sent to a hospital, with the state naturally paying sick leave. There is another problem: the cadre situation. It is impossible to fire a physician who is an ignoramus or a nurse who is incapable of handling patients or of working at all. Attempts to fire such individuals create great amounts of bureaucratic red tape involving the trade unions, conflict commissions and the risk of the initiator of the attempt getting a heart attack from the effort of struggling against incompetent medical personnel. Here are my chief recommendations: liquidate the centralized health care system as quickly as possible, reduce administrative-bureaucratic pressure and disproportions in the system from top to bottom and listen to opinions from below."

There was more than enough criticism directed at various ministries and departments and an abundance of harshness on the subjects addressed in this section, as our readers will attest. That is why a speech by P. P. Zalitis, laboratory chief at the Silava Scientific Production Association, came as such a surprise. Of course, his expert report also did not skirt around difficult issues, but he also noted the successes that have been achieved in forestry in our republic.

"We can note with satisfaction," he said, "that the leaders of this sector react to scientists' suggestions in a swift and efficient manner. As a result the 'administration' of forests in our republic is being carried out on an ecologically sound basis. It is often said and written in the press that our forests are resources. No one could disagree with that. Our forests are a product. And we say to guests from other republics that 'in our republic forests do not grow—they are cultivated.' Our primary tasks are to improve forest yields and to make complete use of all wood products. What have we achieved in this regard? Whereas in 1935 one hectare of forest produced an average of 100 cubic meters, by 1983 that figure had increased to 152 cubic meters. But that is above all the accomplishment of people who are truly enthused about the work they do, who make broad use of the traditions that we have accumulated in our republic."

Fostering Citizens Who Are Harmonious, Mature and Active

All of society has a stake in ensuring that we raise a generation of people who are highly moral, cultured and knowledgeable. That is the imperative of our times. But can the educational system in its present form perform this task? Experience shows that at this time we cannot give an affirmative reply to that question. That is why a reform of higher and secondary schools is currently in progress.

One of the reason for this unsatisfactory state of affairs is, in the opinion of journalist V. V. Seletskis, the fact that for many years our schools functioned and developed in a closed environment. "It was only in words that we asserted that our schools were the most humanitarian and the most democratic, that in our society the principle of 'all the best for the children' prevailed. But the time has come to wake up from this dream. Evaluating our system on the basis of 40 parameters, UNESCO placed the USSR in the 40th percentile of all states. Many countries make broad use of video technology, two-way telecommunications, computers and the opportunities offered by satellites in their educational process. And all our teacher has at his command is chalk, a blackboard and a slide projector.

"Education is the basis of our material and spiritual culture. In the final analysis backwardness in education will manifest itself in a low level of labor productivity, a slow rate of scientific-technical progress and social problems such as alcoholism, a lack of humanity and crime.

"If we want to pull our schools out of this swamp we have only one alternative: to increase sharply the money we allocate for education. Being stingy at the expense of schools is not only shortsighted, but also immoral, because a society with a high level of culture will be forfeited.

"We cannot accept the excuse that there is not enough money. We see how funds are found for the construction of giant industrial projects of dubious value, for the maintenance of a huge administrative apparatus, for the payment of the none-too-fairly-allocated personal pensions, and for the building of stunningly luxurious resorts and administrative centers.

"We are now finding out about the considerable deviations from socialist principles which have occurred in recent years in the economy, politics and culture. The same thing needs to be said about education. The first and most important ideological source of new schools should be the thoughts of Marx and Lenin on education under socialism. We need to study and utilize Latvian national pedagogical traditions, which remain off limits to our teachers. We need to learn from the pedagogical thinking of other countries.

"All the doors and windows of schools should be opened up to art and culture, which are both a means of education and one of its goals. Mathematics, physics and the important, necessary foundations of science can be learned at any age, but it is only in early childhood that we can inculcate in pupils a love of beauty and teach them respect for painting, music and books, just as we would teach them the fundamentals of morality. That is why it is essential that three or four lessons per week be devoted to music and the fine arts in the first five or six grades. In addition, children should have broad opportunities to participate in choruses, clubs and musical groups after school.

"Humanization of our schools requires that other subjects also be utilized to educate children properly. Within the framework of physics and chemistry it is essential that we have a course on ecology, within the framework of biology a broad discussion on the differences between the sexes and family matters. The course on the foundations of the Soviet State and Soviet law should provide children with information on the judicial standards which govern the status of teenagers in society.

"In our teaching of history the most important thing is to free ourselves from falsification and embellishment. Not a single textbook on the history of the USSR or of the LaSSR that we now have can be used as a source of knowledge. We must change orientations in the teaching of literature. Schools should treat the printed word like an art form, not a political treatise. Vulgarization of literature destroys students' respect for books. Literature classes in schools should be like courses in ethics that will help students master the most difficult kind of wisdom: how to live in society.

"Humanization of education means that schools should not be perceived as a hostile force by children. And we will only achieve this when we stop forcibly drilling preprogrammed material into children's heads. We must stop categorizing students as successes or failures. Often when striving for a high success rate a teacher may lose

his or her sense of moderation and humiliate both the pupil and the pupil's parents. This produces mentally ill individuals who are a danger to society, destructive individual who take revenge on others for the humiliation that they suffered in school. Violence in schools and humiliation of weaker children have become more than just isolated occurrences. These are widespread phenomena whose underlying roots must be sought in the violence of teacher against student.

"The only incentives to study should be curiosity and realization of the fact that it is hard to live in this world without an education. It is important to all the members of our intelligentsia and to our entire culture that reason and wisdom regain their lost prestige. This will only happen when intelligence and a person's level of education determine that person's social status. As long as a garbage collector receives a salary twice that of a young physician the outlook for schools and for culture will be very sad.

"And, finally, we must realize that Latvia's educational system cannot be established on the same principles as would apply in Moldavia, Transcaucasia or Siberia. Here we have different traditions, a different culture and different economic needs. There can be basic principles which are valid for the entire country, but each republic needs its own specific curricula, educational plans and textbooks. Does it make sense for students in Riga and Baku to study chemistry out of the same textbook? Here we have a different economy than they do there, different branches of chemistry. Even within the boundaries of Latvia we need to remain open to possible variations.

"There will be no changes in the educational system if the principles of democracy are not put into practice. Thus far we have not gotten any further than electing directors. This will not bring about any substantive changes, because in the education system it is the director who is the 'whipping boy.' We need to tackle the ones who are really to blame for the backwardness of our schools. I feel that we should support the proposal that we also elect the heads of republic departments and ministries. Otherwise we will not be able to break the power of the bureaucracy, which is hampering the process of renewal. Schools should be freed from being under three or four different jurisdictions: that of party committees, ispolkoms and other agencies. Only the Department of Education has a right to intervene in schools' affairs. It is important to ensure that leading positions in school administration are held by people with clear minds, people who are burning with impatience to create the humanitarian schools of tomorrow. At this time many administrative posts are held by workers of the old style, ones whose only ability is to manipulate regulations and orders."

"School is over. Young people have a broad path to VUZs; in our country the boon of higher education is free. But it is only free to the student, not to the state. The state provides the funds, and this is well known to

everyone who teaches or works at a VUZ. Yu. R. Zakis, rector of Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka, is convinced that there is a hidden side to the system of financing by sector. The fields of education, science and culture are all fed from a single source and it is for that reason that it is possible, for example, to have situations in which one area is financed at the expense of another.

"Today we are faced with the fact that Latvian geographers, geologists and ichthyologists are still in a kind of republic 'red book,' while philologists are still trying to continue the debate between academic and VUZ science. In this system for the distribution of labor the alarmed voice of the Academy of Sciences sounds completely logical: 'We are the only ones in this country who do not have our own institute of mathematics.' When we reply that that is what the Latvian State University is, they have a pat answer: 'But we do not have our own such institute.' It seems that even within our own region there is 'our' science and 'your' science, just as there are official academy and VUZ variants of physics, chemistry and biology. I would not be surprised if tomorrow there were separate branches of culture for scientists, writers and teachers. How else can you explain the fact that we are transferring the republic Nature Museum, a tremendous treasure, from one set of hands to another, from the Ministry of Education to the Committee for Protection of the Environment, not realizing that in the world's best VUZs a museum such as this would be used as a wonderful instructional tool.

"In what direction should we orient our education and science? Or, at least, what basic principles should we follow? I think that they can be formulated in brief as follows:

"1) recognition of the need for each republic to conduct a full slate of regularly-scheduled scientific studies of local resources, as well as studies on the ecological and demographic situation, in the form of a state order out of local budget funds; 2) mandatory reconciliation of any changes in production volume in a given region with the capacities of that region's educational system to train mid- and upper-level specialists locally; and 3) provision for unlimited training of citizens with general diploma rights to be paid for by the individual, in addition to the training of specialists whose education is paid for by the state in the form of a state order. In the very near future evening and correspondence courses should make the transition to unlimited paid education exclusively, with payment provided by the institutions where the citizens in question work (institutional order) or by the citizens themselves (individual order)."

The most diverse aspects of education were touched upon at the plenum. One could sense that these problems were among those which are of greatest concern to the intelligentsia. Indicative in this regard is the story of the Philology Department at Latvian State University. It opened in 1966, then later was closed on orders from "higher up." The public, and writers in particular, did not

agree with this decision. The result is obvious: the department was reinstated in 1987. And now, as Professor A. A. Milts noted, we are the only ones in the country operating under an experimental plan and training teachers so that they can teach school children the social sciences, ethics, aesthetics, history and culture in a professional manner and also conduct sociological studies.

Many educational problems are rooted in the family, and this was noted by O. D. Potreki, secretary of the party committee of Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka. At a plenum which concerned itself primarily with matters of a purely humanitarian nature he was the only one who brought up the question of how we should realize the possibilities of scientific-technical thought. Toward what specialized fields are children in Latvian families being oriented? Definitely not toward the ones that form the basic directions in the development of science and technology. The least competition to enter VUZs is among those wishing to study physics or mathematics, yet throughout the world it is mathematical programming firms that have undergone the greatest development.

The condition of our republic's educational system can be changed, no matter how bad it may seem right now. There is one way to do that, and it is fully in harmony with the times. That way is restructuring, and it should be carried out with broad public participation. In this connection many people were dismayed at the candidate chosen to head the newly established Ministry of Education. His appointment makes one think that the system of school and VUZ administration is still far from achieving democracy. The return of the previous minister to his position nourishes conservative forces' hopes that everything will remain the way it was.

A Common Task, A Task for Everyone

At the recent plenum of the USSR Writers' Union V. Karpov, first secretary of the board of that organization, noted the successes of Latvian authors, mentioning the novels "People in Boats" (A. Bels), "Air Bridge" (A. Kalve), "Just One Shining Star" (M. Svire) and "The Bed With the Golden Foot" (Z. Skuin), the short stories of A. Yakuban and A. Neyburga, and, in poetry, new verse by Ya. Peters, I. Ziyedonis, M. Chaklays, M. Misini, M. Zalite, V. Belshevitsa and others. However, there is no doubt that our republic's writers feel dissatisfied with their participation in restructuring.

"An active social stance on the part of an author is one of the characteristic traits of Latvian literature," declared poetess M. Zalite.

"Yet today," she said, "literary activism is not enough for writers to rid themselves of a sense of indebtedness. Latvian literature has a debt to its readers, especially with regard to answers to the larger questions of human existence, especially with regard to all matters relating to

indictment of Stalinist policies, including those in the recent past: the heritage of Stalinism lives on. Writers have perforce become indebted. This process began immediately after the war, at a time when Latvian literature had lost many talented authors, when lists of forbidden books were being compiled, when gradually even such brilliant, strong individuals as Ya. Sudrabkalns and M. Kempe had begun to decay in the 'steel hands'. They became mouthpieces for the official ideology, at the same time experiencing the mental trauma that is typical of people who are essentially honest yet have come into conflict with their own conscience. Can we know what V. Latsis suffered when he was forced by Beria to sign the Council of Ministers deportation order? And did not Latvian writers also 'go into debt' when they were pulling mightily in the direction of 'the new shore,' not seeing the drowning and the already drowned all around them, or rather not daring to see them, not daring to portray what they saw?

"For me personally all this is 'ancient history' (I had not yet been born), but let us speak of my personal experience: the 1970's. At the university there was talk that certain works by Lenin had been banned. They said that L. Briyedis, a young poet, was expelled from the university because he and some classmates had sung nationalistic songs. They said that poet K. Skuyeniyeks was returning from prison, and handwritten copies of his poems were passed around in class. Yes, they were, but we were surprised to find that they contained nothing that spoke to us. What had changed? Essentially, nothing. Except that the absence of intellectual liberty had assumed other forms, more tender forms; in place of the fear of death we had the fear of serious unpleasantness.

"And do we not run up a debt with the people when the social and political atmosphere does not encourage the molding of individuals who are free in their views, but instead provides incentives for duplicity and conformism, when the career ladder is ascended not by the most talented and honest people, but rather by those who have proven most successful at dealing with such 'vestiges of the past' as conscience and honesty? On the whole it is literature that preserves these concepts and expresses them insofar as possible. During the period of stagnation it was literature, and in particular poetry, that provided the spiritual support for the broadest public. Poetry became an intellectual resistance movement, attempting to destroy the unanimity of thinking imposed by the bureaucracy, branching out both thematically and stylistically. The 'Aesopian language' of poetry makes it possible to discuss topics which would be more difficult to express in other genres. Yet now, when there are no serious obstacles (or virtually none) still block the publication of our works, Latvian writers cannot take pride in the works previously written by them but not published. I am talking about our literature overall. It is up to its ears in debt to the readers. But those debts are going to be paid."

"It is beyond the ability of one writer to say everything," said I. Auzin. "A great deal still remains to be said about

the Latvian Rifles, about the fate of Latvians in the Soviet Union, about the deportees, about the guards division, about the partisans, members of the underground resistance and anti-fascists, about the mass extermination of Jews in Latvia and many other things. I would merely like to note that writers would have accomplished much more had it not been for the demagogic cries that have resounded for several decades.

"New pages of our history have been revealed by Chak's 'They Were Touched by Eternity' and other works slated for publication. We are waiting for a novel by Lams and other new works by our writers.

"At the same time the All-Union Press Committee is attempting to get republic publishing houses involved in broad all-union programs for the purpose of publishing children's books and Russian classics. This is happening at a time when a crisis situation exists in our printing industry, when the funding allocated is not sufficient to meet our own needs, with the result that a number of our works are being printed outside of Latvia, in Smolensk, Kiev and Moscow."

The speakers noted that Latvian literature is not sufficiently well known either in our own country or abroad. All our writers are known abroad as "Soviet writers," and usually as Russian ones. The reason for this is not just a lack of information concerning multiethnic Soviet culture. In fact this is a reflection of the policy which has been followed up until now, i.e. a policy aimed at eliminating the differences between the national republics. Soviet literature may be great, but why should the world not know the names Raynis, Vatsiyetis, Ziyedonis or Belshevitsa?

Problems of bilingualism were discussed from a linguist's standpoint by R. E. Veydemane. The following figures are familiar ones: 80 percent of the Latvians living in our republic and 25 percent of the non-Latvian population can use both languages, and 25 percent (sic) of the non- native population does not know Latvian.

Many speakers cited facts which attested to the very alarming situation with regard to Latvian, the realm of usage of which is constantly shrinking. For example, there are entire industrial sectors, including some with long traditions in our republic such as navigation and shipping, where Latvian is virtually not used at all. This was spoken of with equal emotion by both Egon Liv, a writer, and G. Ya. Saltays, chairman of a fishing kolhoz. Another extreme is the fact that even dissertations devoted solely to narrow problems of Latvian linguistics have to be translated into Russian.

"I beg you to recall," said writer Z. Skuinsh, "that Tartu University, for example, never permitted the loss of its rights to confirm its own candidates of sciences. In our republic even Latvian philologists must have their work confirmed in Moscow. Permit me to ask why in the third year of restructuring, after many compliments (in words)

have been addressed to the smaller peoples, is our language even closer to falling into disuse at our own universities than it was before?"

One of the speakers' main themes was the need to do everything possible to encourage the study of Latvian by members of other ethnic groups permanently residing in our republic. Provision should be made for a material incentive for people who know both languages and are employed in public-service sectors.

The creative intelligentsia is a force with the aid of which we can overcome not only the bilingualism barrier, but also make Latvian literature available to all people.

The problem of bilingualism and internationalist education is one of our republic's most acute problems. Attempts have been made to solve it by establishing mixed schools. But as experience has shown these attempts have not always been successful.

"As a writer, I have visited many such schools," said M. G. Kostenetskaya. "They are my most difficult audiences; I cannot imagine any type of educational institution which would be more useless with regard to improving friendship among peoples. Perhaps I have just been unlucky, but thus far I have visited only one school in Latvia where the atmosphere is even partially that of an educational institution to which Imant Ziyedonis would send his grandchildren. There the students in the Russian-language courses greeted me by singing songs of the Latvian Rifles. When I asked the mixed audience whether they could speak Latvian, whether they understood everything I said, they replied that they did. But in our republic a school such as this is merely an exotic exception."

"The fanfare of the stagnation period and efforts to pass off wishful thinking as reality gave rise to false stereotypes," said Ya. Kh. Rukshans, following up on the same topic. "One such stereotype was praise for mixed schools, which was heard at the highest levels. The prestige of such schools is substantially less in the eyes of both parents and students than that of normal educational institutions.

"In order to achieve genuine bilingualism in the Leninist sense of the word it is essential that we immediately revise the curricula of schools where Russian is the language of instruction. In the national republics instruction should follow a single curriculum, regardless of which language is used. It should also be made mandatory that the required number of lessons in a second language of Soviet peoples should be the same at every school in our republic."

Like all the speakers, journalist I. P. Litvinova realizes the need for more effective study of Latvian. But she feels that in view of the level of instruction currently existing in our republic that is impossible. "Quite frankly, by the second school year Russian children have

had the desire to study Latvian ground out of them. I think that the educational system and the intelligentsia should take responsibility and create the proper conditions to ensure that instruction is actually carried out. One expert said that it is not right that in Latvian-language schools five lessons per week are devoted to Russian, whereas Russian-language schools devote only two lessons per week to Latvian. But even that number of classes are not actually being held. Today I picked up SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA and read that this year there are no teachers of Latvian studying at the Daugavpils Pedagogical Institute at all. Who is going to teach our children?"

Problems connected with bilingualism are equally acute in both the republic capital and in other rayons. "For example," said teacher A. A. Rantsans, "there are two Latvian-language schools and four Russian-language schools Rezekne. Therein lies the problem. Of the 16 members of the Rezekne Party Gorkom only five know both Latvian and Russian. The rest behave as if bilingualism is no concern of theirs.

"We have little hope of reeducating adults. School and life are not two separate things. I would like to say that life begins in school. If there is no culture at educational institutions, then what sort of culture will there be in everyday life? I chanced to overhear a conversation between a female teacher at Rezenke Secondary School #3 and her students. They called Raynis an artist and Stuchka a poet. And they had never even heard of Latgale ceramics. There are 41 students in that class, and only a couple of them speak Latvian.

"At one time there was strict monitoring of the teaching of Russian in Latvian-language schools. Even today teachers of Russian receive a 15- percent salary bonus. Schools equate internationalist education with intensified teaching of Russian to Latvian children. But is knowledge of Russian synonymous with internationalism?"

The resolution adopted at the plenum reflected a proposal made by writer Imant Ziyedonis and supported by many others, suggesting that Latvian, as well the languages of the other national republics, be declared official languages. This act would not violate constitutional standards and would merely serve to stimulate internationalism and improve our country's humanitarian image. Incidentally, this has already been done in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. It is another matter altogether as to whether this action would eliminate all our problems.

Special Attention Zone

The arts and commerce. Until quite recently those two terms would have been combined only in a negative context. But today the economy has made massive inroads into the cultural realm as well. A report delivered by Ya. A. Liyepinsh, head of the Foreign Economic

Relations Department under the LaSSR Council of Ministers Administration of Affairs, was devoted to the subject of cooperation with foreign partners in this area.

Currently our cultural field is in urgent need of funding and capital investment. In a number of instances hard currency is needed. This means that commerce is involved in the cultural field as well. For many years these commercial transactions were made by all-union organizations, giving rise to alienation, bureaucracy and unnecessary complications. For example, five different organizations were involved in the sale of a single painting. The republic leadership feels that commercial transactions in the cultural realm can also be concluded at the local level. Under existing legislation all republic enterprises and organizations have the right to conduct transactions with partners in socialist countries, and the Interlatviya Association has the right to do so with the representatives of capitalist countries.

During the initial period in the operations of that association, which was established in July of last year, the cultural field was not given adequate attention, as it is not the most profitable sector. Now the situation has changed. Our republic government has adopted a resolution stating the need to establish a specialized firm within Interlatviya which will handle transactions in the fields of motion pictures, television, the fine arts, applied art and other areas of cultural activity.

Whereas in foreign contacts commerce is a boon, it has led to the degradation of the theatrical arts as it has penetrated that sector, in the opinion of V. M. Matulevich, secretary of the board of the LaSSR Union of Theatrical Workers and director of the Valmierskiy State Theater of Drama imeni L. Paegle. "The repertoire now follows the principle that demand determines supply. What we have is an intolerable situation in which administrators have assumed a certain role in the theatrical process, and the theaters themselves have been converted into 'forbidden zones,' not open to criticism.

"Figures speak more eloquently than any amount of words about the condition of the theatrical arts. For example, before the war Latvia had 12 theaters, Lithuania three and Estonia 8. Today the situation is this: Latvia has nine theaters, of which two are outside the capital, and Lithuania has 11 and seven, respectively; Estonia has nine and four. Since the war only one new theater building has been built, for the State Academic Theater imeni Ya. Raynis. The Riga Russian Drama Theater has undergone capital renovations. The remainder are in poor condition.

"Cadre training is also in a sorry state. The acting companies of all our theaters are overstaffed. Imbalance in the age of performers and the structure of the troupes has a negative effect on theatrical collectives' development. Only one director with specialized education works at our two musical theaters. There are no choreographers. Yet at the same time directors for dramatic

theaters are being trained en masse. Between 1979 and 1985 15 graduates of the Latvian Conservatory holding a professional director's degree were sent to our republic's six dramatic theaters. This year an additional 16 persons will receive that degree.

"Our republic Union of Theatrical Workers has sent a number of suggestions to the LaSSR CP Central Committee. Our public has been promised many things that could improve the status of culture and the arts in our republic. For example, the Culture 2000 Comprehensive Program. I feel that it is a utopian idea."

Our creative intelligentsia has not expressed great delight at this comprehensive program. This is understandable. No matter what area of culture we consider, everywhere we find decay. Houses of culture, libraries, museums—all of them need repairs or new buildings. But, as G. K. Asaris, chief architect of Riga, has said, even if we carry out the entire program of cultural facilities construction envisioned for the current five-year plan the capacity of theaters and concert halls in Riga will only be 60 percent of established standards, that of houses of culture and clubs only a little over 50 percent, and that of movie theaters no more than 70 percent. The speakers spoke about the cultural environment and the problems of artistic design, hoping to draw the public's attention to solutions for these pressing problems.

Many examples of incompetent decisions in the arts field were heard. For example, musicologist A.-L. E. Klotin mentioned the completely unjustified ban on I. Kalninsh's oratorio "Poet i rusalka" [The Poet and the Mermaid]. There have also been similar cases in the field of cinematography in our republic.

It will be impossible to improve fundamentally the situation in the cultural realm if our republic leaders do not heed the competent opinion of cultural workers. It is essential that the LaSSR Council of Ministers consider the condition of theaters' material-technical base and that of other areas of culture and the arts and guarantee real implementation of appropriate resolutions adopted in this regard.

We should recall that in the cultural realm success does not depend on the work of administrative agencies and ministerial reorganization. The basis for success is the individual's inner creative activism. The bureaucracy never has been able to stimulate the development of culture; this has been stated by many members of the creative intelligentsia. There is no doubt that the way culture is administered must be changed. Perhaps this field should even be turned over completely to enthusiasts, specialists and public organizations. A Culture Committee is to be established soon. Dramatist P. Yu. Petersons made the suggestion that this new institution be headed by an individual who is diverse, who feels the pain of and feels responsible for the fate of our cultural heritage and its further flourishing. As for the drafting of

a comprehensive program, in the opinion of plenum participants such a program should not be approved without broad preliminary public discussion.

Historical Truth Is the Source of Healthy Social Development

A tree cannot live without roots. History is the roots of any people or society. Therefore no matter what current issues the speakers touched upon they sought explanation of today's situation in the recent past as well. At the beginning of the discussion objective and indisputable conclusions were accompanied by debatable or else completely unproven assertions; there were quite a few of the latter. But one thing was obvious: in all the ardent polemics one could sense a sincere desire to explore, comprehend and analyze our times, so that there will be no repetition of those things which run counter to the Leninist concept of socialism.

Incompetent analysis of historical events without substantiating facts, cover-ups, half-truth and the continued existence of the so-called "blank spots" in history are harmful and are not only a false basis for perceptions and evaluations, but also a source of political demagoguery. This thought, put forth at the plenum, is not merely a warning. It also contains an explanation of the phenomenon of historical distortions spoken of by plenum participants in their discussion of the past. At this revolutionary time, when the consciousness of the people is being raised, it is the task of our generation to affirm that Latvia today is not merely a territory, but also a republic, a state entity with its own history.

"It is no secret that until recently the science of history was dominated by the scholastic, oversimplified model of the historical process of socialist construction in our country," noted A. A. Drizul, vice-president of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, in his address to the plenum. "The foundations of this model were laid down in the late 1920's, at the beginning of the deviations from Leninist concepts for the building of a new society. The Stalinist model of history rested on three pillars: the cult of authoritative leaders, the Bible-like sanctity of the basic theses of the Stalinist course, and historical myths, which were actively sown in people's minds. The most significant of those myths was 'Stalin is today's Lenin.' But the renunciation of Lenin began following the 17th Party Congress. A total of 1,961 delegates attended that conference, and of these 1,225 had the right to a deciding vote. The Stalinist terror exterminated 1,108 of these congress delegates. Of the 71 Central Committee members elected at the 17th Party Congress 52 were killed, including five Latvians: K. Bauman, V. Knorin, V. Mezhlauks, Ya. Rudzutak and R. Eykhe. The repressions intensified and expanded with each passing year. Among those repressed were members of every nation and nationality in the USSR, every class and social group, every profession and age group."

The consequences of these tragic events, formative events for the political system of the USSR, for Latvia and its people were outlined in a speech by M. G. Vulfson, international journalist. "We must learn to look truth in the face, no matter how hard or unbearable it may be," he appealed. "This also applies to the interpretations which we continue to give for the events in Latvia in the summer of 1940. In recent months I have received approximately 200 letters from every corner of our republic. The opinion contained in those letters is that the establishment of a Soviet government in Latvia was preordained by the Ribbentrop-Molotov treaty of 23 August 1939."

Outlining the consistency of the events of those days when the Red Army entered Latvian territory and the political leadership underwent changes, the speaker, whose viewpoint, it should be noted, diverges greatly from the evaluation of the political situation of that time given by authoritative historians of our republic, posed the following question: "Can we seriously say that precisely at that time in Latvia and simultaneously in Estonia and Lithuania a revolutionary situation was created or reached maturity? In general it should be noted that antisocialist and anti-Soviet positions were held not only by the upper echelons of the Latvian bourgeoisie, but also by a segment of the petty bourgeoisie and substantial portion of the intelligentsia. The large demonstration held on 21 June and involving 70,000-75,000 participants was in nature anti-fascist, anti-Ulmanis and favorable to democratization of the state. However, the slogan 'For a Soviet Latvia' was sanctioned by Vyshinskiy only after the election of the seym. If we also take into account falsification of the results of elections at the 17th Party Congress by Stalin, concerning which we can read in the press, then I feel that it is rather difficult to believe that 180,000 members of the Latvian bourgeoisie and Latvian intelligentsia voluntarily voted for people's power in Latvia."

The nature of these conclusions reminds us of the well-known idea that evaluation of historical moments requires extreme caution and a good documentary basis. Our past experience is eloquent testimony to that. Incidentally, the debatable nature of these assertions was graphically emphasized by a further statement by the same speaker: "I am aware that it is very difficult for us to write history now. But taking into account the fact that the overthrow of the authoritarian regime and Latvia's socialist choice were progressive phenomena I feel that that era of history can and should be written. It is essential that we develop a 100-percent accurate history of the 1939-41 period, so that no one can say anything against us."

"I have no desire," the speaker went on to say, "and this is my subjective opinion, for us to discuss the establishment of Soviet power in Latvia. The Soviet system which existed in Latvia in 1919 was based upon support by an absolute majority of the Latvian people. I would like to quote from a statement by a comrade (deputy) chairman

of the People's Council (i.e. Ulmanis's de facto deputy), Gustav Zemgal. It is dated 21 December 1918 and is addressed to Ulmanis's office: 'Hand over power to those in whom the people have the greatest trust, that is, to the Bolsheviks.' And when the English sailors left Riga its fate was decided—the Latvian Rifles entered Riga. This system was based upon the Latvian Rifles, 35,000-40,000 strong. This system was hailed by Lenin's faithful comrade-in-arms Yakov Sverdlov, but not by Vyshinskiy. That was a different type of system. I do not want us to equate the establishment of the Stalinist regime in Latvia with the formation of an independent socialist Soviet Latvia in 1919."

Efforts to arrive at a precise definition of the nature of past facts and events were also reflected in an evaluation of the nature of the Ulmanis dictatorship given by A. A. Drizul. Immediately after the takeover of 15 May the Latvian CP characterized it as fascist in nature. In an international situation in which fascism had launched a broad offensive against bourgeois/parliamentary governments in most European countries this was quite understandable and even natural. In 1935 the 7th Comintern Congress was held; there G. Dimitrov gave the classic definition of fascism: the ruling bourgeoisie to an ever greater extent seeks salvation through fascism, in the establishment of an overt terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of financial capital.

Therefore when analyzing the Ulmanis dictatorship from a strictly scientific standpoint it would seem possible to apply this definition to the conditions existing at that time in Latvia. True, in order to draw final conclusions it will be necessary to do considerable research on the specific historical situation of the 1930's. The material which we currently possess permits us to say that the Ulmanis regime is best described as a profascist dictatorship.

"In the history of any state there are many possible variants," said Dzhemma Skulme, people's artist of the LaSSR. "There is also much that is immoral, despotic and erroneous. But these things are revealed later, after society, opinions and views have changed. The greatest stumbling block in our social sciences is its stagnation, the unchanging nature of its views and appraisals. We have propaganda, but where can we find genuine history? Things were not the way we have been told; the things in which we believed did not exist. Yes, it seems that we entered a reactionary formation, the antidemocratic state of the Stalinist dictatorship, a regime that claimed millions of victims. We entered a state with poor economic indices, scant agricultural successes and a low standard of living. Gradually, over a period of many years, many things occurred within us as well."

"We must talk about the undemanding attitudes dictated by the course toward a worsening state of affairs, and historically we must mention Arvid Pelshe, aesthete and connoisseur of porcelain, who said: 'In what way are we

any better than other republics?' It was with his blessing that our republic set a course toward unrestricted industrialization, a course which has brought all these irreversible changes. Today we have shortages of essential goods. When we see this we ask ourselves: who actually won World War II? Especially if we look at war-ravaged Germany, both Germanys, and compare them with our situation in terms of our economy, ecology, demography and culture. When we study our own culture we present a strongly idealized portrait of socialism and, I might add, do so a great deal of talent, scope and enthusiasm."

"We will not deny that all of us were, at least up through my generation, participants in these processes," said director P. Yu. Petersons. "The nature of fascism, like that of the Stalinist dictatorship, must be sought not in one maniacal personality, but rather in the atmosphere, the soil created with genius by a maniac, soil in which little Hitlerites and Stalinites could spawn millions more like themselves."

"Despotism has always been based on fear and betrayal."

Poetess Mara Zalite mentioned Niyedre, Grigulis and other writers of that generation whose position seems to her terrible and tragic because at one time that position had an influence on the fate of our cultural heritage. "The unhealthy complex of accumulated fears on the part of these people on account of their prior activities is seen as the basis for this position: some of them were to a greater or lesser degree connected with social democracy. But I have seen with my own eyes the birth of new generations, no longer intimidated by the horrors of Stalinism and uncompromised by their past. It is these generations which have produced our present-day type of neo-Stalinist functionaries, who are masters of the language of demagoguery."

A special political maturity, civic courage and a brave willingness to oppose all things reactionary is needed if we are not to overlook the danger from that quarter, if we are not to let the mistakes of history be repeated. This task can only be performed through consolidation of progressive-thinking forces. Plenum participants spoke of this, pondered it, appealed for it.

Tell Me Who Your Friend Is...

Condemnation at the plenum of many problems relating to ethnic and interethnic relations was more of an emotional than an analytical nature. And that is understandable. We are not yet accustomed to discussing this complex subject in a public forum. Restructuring has laid bare many sore points and revealed hidden sources of tension. For interethnic relations are like a mirror reflecting the entire complex of social and economic problems, and the more serious those problems are the more easily negative phenomena arise in the area of ethnic self-awareness. This process is exacerbated not

only by the unresolved status of many vitally important issues, but also by distortions in linguistic culture and the educational system and inadequate representation of ethnic groups.

Dzhemma Skulme asked why a person should be liked and treated with respect merely because that person is a German, a Russian or a Latvian. And she replied: "We need to respect only human beings. And only then concern ourselves with the ethnic identity of those human beings."

"Why are we, the creative intelligentsia, concerning ourselves with the nationalities question? Because we are the only ones who preserved our sense of responsibility during the years of stagnation. More often than not art is resistance. And values can only be formed with its aid. A sense of responsibility also gives one rights. We have a right to state here today that our nation is undergoing a process of assimilation."

Poetess M. E. Zalite presented her treatment of this difficult topic.

"During the period of Stalinism and stagnation one of the most acute unresolved topics was the so-called nationalities question," she said. "In words the free development and flourishing of each nation under socialism was declared. However, any attempt to doubt those declarations on the basis of real facts was categorized as a manifestation of bourgeois nationalism. No dialogue was possible. Stalinist dogmas relative to nationalities policy were carried to absurd lengths. Concern for the physical and spiritual viability of a people, the characteristics which determine the economic health of our republic and the might of our country as a whole, was viewed as an act of subversion against the security of the state. The activities of folk groups and folklore itself were considered dangerous. At A. Ya. Pelshe's initiative the LaSSR Academy of Science Institute of Folklore and Ethnography was dissolved. The consequences of this are being keenly felt today as we make preparations for the Baltic'88 International Folk Festival.

"Now we have realized (but have we all realized it?) that a nationalities policy thus interpreted not only does not strengthen our state, but in fact destroys it, discredits socialism, gives rise to deep dissatisfaction, provokes people to excesses and at the same time weakens the cultural and economic potency of a specific people and of the country as a whole."

"Latvians are currently on the verge of extinction," she went on. "Is that what the Latvian Red Rifles fought for? Is that what Raynis had in mind when he formulated his political ideal as 'a free Latvia within a free Russia'? Is that why L. Paegle, L. Laytsen, A. Balodis and V. Kalpin languished in the jails of bourgeois Latvia? Is that why Latvia joined the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? Can we go on living with the thought that we are the last generation of the intelligentsia of a dying people?"

To whom were these words addressed, and what effect were they calculated to produce? It is highly doubtful that such nonspecific and poorly documented conclusions as these either conform to reality or foster inter-ethnic convergence. Perhaps these words were said in an outburst of passion and were prompted by the best intentions. Nevertheless they will be seized upon eagerly by the extremists and social demagogues who strive to maintain interethnic friction. Naturally there should be a vital, frank dialogue and public discussion of nationalities problems in this period of democratization and expanding glasnost. But in the process one should defend one's opinion and debate without insults and inflamed ambitions, with respect for the ethnic sensibilities of others, helping people draw closer together rather than pulling them apart. Unfortunately some of the speakers had evidently set their sights on inciting an unhealthy atmosphere of ethnic confrontation, supporting their deductions with "evidence" based on graffiti scrawled on fences, and read in only one language at that. But these were only isolated speeches. More often we heard speeches which did not attempt to smooth over difficult issues yet still amounted to more than a declaration of mutual insults and mutual misunderstanding.

"These two days have been very important in the life of our people," said television journalist E. E. Inken. "I hope that after such an open dialogue as this one at least some of our unhealthy prejudices with regard to our ethnic sensibilities, which are pure and honest, will disappear. I think that this plenum will knock the props out from under various extremists."

Radio journalist A. V. Berkis spoke in a constructive manner, desirous of helping resolve existing problems: "We do not need to contrast ourselves with others, saying 'We are Latvians, and you are Russians.' And they are not just Russians, but rather people of various nationalities: Ukrainians, Moldavians... We must also preserve their ethnic identity, creating for them schools, communities and regional organizations so that they can feel like members of their own people. No one should be lost in our diverse crowd. It is in our interest to support all minorities."

This stance is dear and understandable today to everyone who strives to truly realize the principles of Lenin's nationalities policy. And quite a few constructive, reality-inspired opinions like this were heard. Sometimes they were not formulated with complete clarity, and they were not always based on analysis of the many twists and turns of this complex issue. We feel that these difficulties could have been completely avoided if the speakers had more thoroughly acquainted themselves with the materials of the LaSSR CP Central Committee Plenum held 5 May in Riga. That plenum discussed the question "On the Tasks of the Republic Party Organization With Regard to Intensification of Ideological-Political, Internationalist and Patriotic Education of Working People at the Current Stage of Restructuring." The plenum also

considered many issues which are of concern to the public, including such timely matters as the development of ethnic and interethnic relations and ways of instilling a sense of internationalism.

Naturally discussion of these problems prompted a reaction from all participants.

"As one of the ethnic groups on our planet the Russian people are no better and no worse than any other people," stressed M. G. Kostenetskaya, a writer. "Russians, just like Latvians, have suffered a great deal in this century, and it would be unfair not to take into account the fact that in the past 70 years the Russian people have also been subjected to genocide against the peasantry and the intelligentsia.

"I as a member of the Russian intelligentsia in this national republic am just as concerned about the questions of migration and bilingualism as are members of the native population."

This subject was taken up by I. P. Litvinova, department chief of the editorial staff of SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH: "Today it is the task of the republic mass media, especially those directed at the republic's Russian population, to make people fully aware of these fears and these problems, so that our readers can share them with us and consider together with us how we can all continue to live together and resolve these problems, because this is a matter that concerns everyone."

Like the Russians, Jews have also long been neighbors of Latvians and had close contacts with them.

"This is the oldest minority in Latvia," said journalist M.G. Vulfson. "For 500 years now Jews and Latvians alike have drunk more than one bitter cup to the dregs on this soil. They served together in the ranks of those who fought in 1905 and in the Latvian Rifles, whose commissar was Semen Nakhimson, they fought together in the underground, I repeat, in the underground, although at that time there were 66 Jewish primary schools, 11 secondary schools and a Riga Jewish Theater with 30 actors in bourgeois Latvia. But the Jewish proletariat and other progressive members of that nationality dreamed of a socialist Latvia, dreamed that it would grant Jews more rights.

"We have two problems. Firstly, we want to erect a monument to the 300,000 Jews who were ruthlessly exterminated in Latvia during the war. Of that number 220,000 were brought here from more than 10 European countries; 80,000 were residents of Latvia. Out of the total number of persons killed 72,000 were children under the age of 12. We would like for this monument to be erected on the site of the former synagogue, into which in July 1941, two days after the invasion of German troops, the fascists herded hundreds of children, women and old men of Jewish nationality and then

burned them alive. And, secondly, we hope that Comrade A. P. Rubiks will not have any objection to the creation of a Zhan Lipke Museum on the Kipsala. By doing this we would like to pay homage to the Latvian heroes who at the risk of their own lives and the lives of their loved ones saved dozens of ghetto prisoners from certain death. We have been told that the Kipsala is not the appropriate place for this. Zhan Lipke lived there, hide doomed people there, fought there."

"I am very much taken," noted academician Ya. P. Stradyn, "by M. G. Vulfson's idea concerning the erection of a monument to the Jews, the children, who were exterminated during the Hitlerite occupation. And it seems to me that Latvians should participate in this task in order to acknowledge the guilt of our own countrymen, for it was Latvians who did the shooting."

Then the scientist went on to say: "We need political culture, that is what they teach us. But was the appointment of Avgust Boss to serve as delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference an example of political culture in Latvia, where his name is linked to the period of stagnation? He should not have been appointed.

"If the walls of this hall were to open up and all these speeches were to be broadcast—in simultaneous translation—on the public squares to the broad masses, what would happen then? Would the masses applaud? I think that there would be a great disturbance. One group would applaud, another would whistle, and yet another would try to pick a fight. A great polarization exists within our society. And lightning can strike as a result. Therefore I feel that if we are to bear responsibility before history we must do everything we can to ensure that Latvia does not become another Sumgait or Ulster, because that could actually happen. I want our Baltic republics, Latvia and Riga to become even more beautiful. But that takes action, first of all by the government and the party, but also, of course, from all people who feel a sense of responsibility for what happens here."

Breathing the Fresh Air of Democracy

"There is no other way out of the difficulties facing our country except the course toward democratization which is being carried out by the CPSU according to a carefully prepared plan," said stenographer Yu. A. Dimiter in a speech filled with that conviction. "A shift to the right, i.e. a victory for tendencies toward strict bureaucratic methods and 'tightening the screws' will not only not solve any problems, it will, on the contrary, exacerbate those problems to an extreme and lead our country into a tragic dead end. The tactic of passive survival will in the end have the same result.

"What Stalin created was not socialism, much less Soviet power in the sense of power exercised by all the people. This bureaucratically centralized, authoritarian party

and state apparatus was created for the purpose of maintaining and strengthening one-man rule. Later, during the period of stagnation, all this was further reinforced.

"We were subjected to repression the whole time, like little children. Paintings were ripped off of walls, books banned, exhibits closed, poems blotted out, movies censored or hidden, musical groups persecuted. We were told what we could and could not read, when to read 'Small Land' and when to read 'Renaissance'. Instructions, circulars, secret and public regulations, directives, decisions, classified and open letters, telex messages, telephone calls, 'opinions,' forms and so on poured down from above in an unending stream.

"To me it seems that the most important thing is to provide constitutional guarantees for the new democracy and create a mechanism for defending one's rights which will not permit forcible resolution of a conflict, because thus far the structure of power, the institutions and the legal mechanisms remain the old ones inherited from the past.

"I feel that the primary issue today is democratization of the party apparatus and the broadest possible openness regarding party work. Since it is the party that has taken the initiative in restructuring, it should be the first to set an example.

"Lenin said that we must take a cultured approach even to the most simple matters of state. This means that each matter of state and the entire state apparatus from bottom to top must be raised to the highest cultural level. Therefore today it seems anachronistic that the Bureau of our republic CP Central Committee does not have a single creative cultural figure as a member. If the Bureau has its symbolic blue-collar worker, then it could, at least symbolically, have one of us, if only out of respect for Lenin.

"If we really want to change something then we, the intelligentsia, will not be able to avoid doing some penance," according to A. Ya. Kletskin, senior instructor at Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka. "It seems to me that we are very assiduous at levelling various types of claims against leaders of various ranks. But I think that we as members of the intelligentsia are guilty before our people and before society. Perhaps not guilty of participating, although we did also participate, but of standing on the sidelines, keeping quiet, protecting ourselves, etc. We must not forget that."

Television journalist E. E. Inken, referring to restructuring, said that democratization of public life was its primary process. Democratization has one iron rule: determine the opinion of the majority. The minority also has legal guarantees, he stressed. "Society is heterogeneous. I would even say that it is divided. Those who are now marching under the banner of restructuring are praising the same word, but for different reasons. We are

only taking the first steps, but 'we' still does not mean all of us. I am afraid that many people only believe in the irreversibility of restructuring at the level of meetings. Remember the silence that fell after Andreyeva's article appeared. Silence throughout the state, even at meetings.

"We often hear the idea of a 'people's front' expressed. But where was the people's front against Andreyeva? Or must we wait for the formal organization of this people's front? Many people panicked and began to believe that one morning they would wake up and read in the newspaper that restructuring had been a mistake."

Many of the speakers commented that we have still done nothing to make the work of our party under the existing system democratic. The party is restructuring society and itself, and currently there is no other force except the party and its present leaders which could really guide this restructuring and guarantee that it will be successful. But, of course, we must ensure that the irreversibility of restructuring, the irreversibility of democratization of the party and of society, does not depend solely upon the goodwill of the present leaders. Here we need the methods and principle of elective office in party organs. Among other tasks, the party's function as guarantor against bureaucratism in the state and economic apparatus should be defined.

But there were also other opinions. "It is very important to look bravely at oneself from outside," said Dzhemma Skulme, LaSSR people's artist. "On the eve of the 19th Party Conference we must make an expert judgment: is the party setting the pace in the restructuring process? Judging by party affairs in our republic, its real role is to wait and see, regulate, then regulate again. We are waiting for true democratization of party affairs and lifting of the bans that have been imposed; we are waiting for openness toward the people."

Ya. P. Lutsans, chairman of the board of the Komunars Agricultural Combine, sees the cause of many of Latvia's economic woes in the unprincipled stance of the past republic leadership and in violations of democratic principles. "The big leaders of the state came and went," he said, "and occasionally a hurricane of intensification swept through our village. For some reason, due to the pliability of our leaders, these changes weighed more heavily on us than on the neighboring republics, which were governed by Snechkus and Masherov. Many capable specialists suffered because of these destructive campaigns. They took transfers to other sectors, grew and sold tulips, worked as agents of the Main Insurance Administration, while the 'zealous,' 'obedient' administrators went unpunished. Many of them are still leading us today; perhaps they are screaming about restructuring the same way they talked and screamed about the latest campaign in the past. The Daugavpils Hydroelectric Power Station, the Olayne chemical industry, the sewers of Riga, Yurmala, the decades-long persecution of the Ligo holiday, loss of the people's history: who was responsible for that?"

"The most important event in the near future will be the All-Union Party Conference, to which delegates have just been appointed. What happened in Limbzhskiy Rayon, for example, where the representatives of many farm party organizations were not even invited to the meeting of the aktiv, attests to the fact that we must be especially vigilant if we intend to prevent a victory by the bureaucratic apparatus."

Writer A. P. Bels titled his speech "Subjective Thoughts on Objective Reality." "The skeptics are of the opinion that since the death of Lenin not a single attempt at democratization of society has been successful," he said. "This means, they say, that restructuring will also fail. Therefore the main thing now is just to stay in the saddle until the old days return. There is a certain degree of logic in this. Indeed, even the mighty wave of frankness at the 20th CPSU Congress was squelched and silence restored."

"The foundations of political culture in Latvia were virtually destroyed by Ulmanis during the takeover of 15 May 1934. Efforts to restore political culture were destroyed by Stalinism in 1940-41. We have still not fully calculated the losses incurred during the years of the Hitlerite occupation. However, it seems to me that after taking part in the victory over Nazism Latvia also began to breathe a bit more freely in a political sense. But a death blow was dealt to this in 1949, when quite a few actively thinking citizens were deported. In my opinion that was precisely the objective of the deportation. And, finally, the final blow to hopes for a revival of Latvian political culture was dealt in 1959, when those people who by some amazing chance remained in the Latvian leadership were morally degraded."

"For me restructuring is also the future for those dear to me. Without restructuring Latvia has no future. Restructuring means national and political rebirth."

The words of poetess A. R. Litse struck a similar chord. "I realized how closely connected are faith and disbelief in restructuring right here in our republic, how thin is the layer of enthusiasm if there are no guarantees. By guarantees I mean glasnost at all levels and appropriate actions. People want to believe but they cannot. This is the effect of the errors of the recent past. Therefore our fiery speeches are perceived as tablets of validol or an injection of Analgin, which only take away the pain for a little while. But there are questions to which people do know the answers. They have learned to tell the difference between people who feign restructuring and those who really are restructuring. And in this respect even the highest forums are to no avail. And we are trying to smooth over unhealed wounds. But untreated wounds will not heal. The time has come to acknowledge that the deportations of 1941 and 1949 were illegal and to restore the good names of those who were exiled, and take away the good names of those who profited by their deportation."

At this point it is appropriate to underscore the fact that many of the suggestions made at the plenum have already been carried out through specific action. For example, the republic government has set up a commission to consider the petitions of individuals requesting that their administrative deportation from the LaSSR be rescinded. The commission has submitted a proposal to our country's party and law enforcement organs suggesting that the mass deportations of those years be declared illegal.

In the opinion of journalist V. M. Avotins what we need is not reform, but instead revolutionary capital repairs on society. "Therefore I do not want the decisions of this plenum to be divided up into individual reformist demands, into individual requests to eliminate individual shortcomings in individual areas."

"There is also a need to talk about a 'boring' subject like power. 'Anything goes' is not democracy. Until the power itself belongs to the people, until the style of power and its politics are freed from darkness and stagnation, until then the main freedom which it will be able to guarantee us is the freedom to elbow our way ahead."

"It is clear that the forces favoring deceleration will make their principal appeal to the working class. Therefore journalists and writers must explain to people in an accessible, comprehensible language what they need to do in order to be able to depend upon the state's genuine concern and protection. People would reject the voluntarism of the bureaucrats if they knew that they could rely on the state with confidence. It is relatively easy to buy a worker by giving him an apartment or a bonus, or merely by leaving him in peace. However, it should be made clear that no other class has been so consciously kept in the dark, no other class has been subjected to such total destabilization of its traditions, no one else has been subjected to the same degree of professional and cultural degradation through the mechanism of total, unjustified migration and through the effect of ever-multiplying, excusing-making decisions and with the aid of cheap propaganda as has the working class. Those in power required an average, lackluster individual. That was what they produced, providing him with food, minimal entertainment and well-controlled hopes for a better life. Of course, not all blue-collar workers have submitted to the bureaucracy. But a very widespread lumpen proletariat has been created, and it stands ready at any moment to support whatever it is told to by the higher-ups. It is to this stratum of lumpen proletariat, which unfortunately also includes some members of the intelligentsia who lack inner culture and convictions, that all the reactionary forces are appealing, pinning their hopes on the grey unity of the mob, gambling that it can be bought off."

We can scarcely call this appraisal of the working class objective. But was it not this appraisal that resulted in not a single worker's voice being heard at the plenum?

In his speech Ya. Kh. Rukshans, editor of the magazine *DARZS UN DRAVA* examined the constitutionally guaranteed right to freedom and opportunity to express one's political opinions. "The open press is a public confession of the people, the spiritual mirror in which it sees itself. The free press is a living spring that strengthens the soul. These were the views held by the founders of Marxism concerning the press. And thus it was in the early years of the Soviet State, when opposition forces were also given an opportunity to speak.

"If the party could afford such discussions immediately after the victory of the revolution, at a time when it was surrounded by enemies, is it not strange that it is afraid of them today? The official press is just beginning to free itself from the heritage of the past.

"Recall 14 June and 23 August of last year and the tendentious coverage of those events in the official press. Thousands of people participated in those events, and they saw flagrant militia brutality with their own eyes," said Ya. Kh. Rukshans.

This is one typical example of one-sided or even prejudiced perception of a problem by certain speakers. Specifically, no one said anything about the fact that the nature of the events around the Freedom Monument was determined by elements of an openly hooliganistic slant, that there were people there whose behavior cannot be classified as anything but provocative and included instances of unprovoked, insulting acts directed at law enforcement officers.

Continuing, Ya. Kh. Rukshans proposed that Stalin, Zhdanov, Vyshinskiy and others who inspired bloody reprisals be expelled from the party, directed criticism at a number of past and present leaders of our republic (I. A. Anderson, V. M. Krumin, Yu. Ya. Ruben, O. G. Misurkin and M. L. Raman) on account of the results of their work in the fields of economics and nationalities policy. However, this criticism would not stand up to any well-argued rebuttal. And the pointlessness of indiscriminate approaches, narrow-mindedness and lack of evidence was particularly evident in a number of speeches.

"The Writers' Union and other creative unions," said, among other things, Professor E. Ya. Gren, "have gathered here today not only for us to discuss our problems, but also so that we can do something about solving them. It is essential that we establish an active commission which will take the initiative not only for getting us all together for a joint discussion. We should also meet in order to work together toward resolving our common problems."

Discuss, Propose and Resolve

When speaking of the need for democratic transformations the speakers in one way or another deviated from

the range of topics connected with defense of the accomplishments of restructuring. The mind-boggling possibilities offered to each citizen by freedom of discussion under glasnost prompts some citizens to utter practical, constructive thoughts, yet for others this is more like an opportunity to sound off in an original and unaccustomed fashion.

It should be noted that essentially not one single speaker conceived of our system outside the context of Soviet power in all the discussion of pressing modern problems. M. Ya. Lemeshev, doctor of ecological sciences, pointed to the soviets, to Soviet power, as the most serious force capable of combatting the damages caused by the actions of the bureaucrats:

"But it is the power of the soviets which in our country lacks resources behind it," he commented. "After studying the example of Yurmala I have come to the conclusion that its city soviet has nothing at all, and when the ministries of special construction or the machine building industry come and want to build a resort, then the soviet provides it with a construction site and cuts down pines among the dunes. They do everything because the ministries promise to donate a million and a half toward the building of a television station in the city and to help build a waste treatment system on the land allotted to them. We must restore the soviets' economic power. Only then can we solve ecological problems.

"We must ensure that the public will also act under the leadership and aegis of Soviet power, of our deputies. We have grown accustomed to not knowing who our deputies are or what they are doing. Or whether they are defending the public's interests at sessions of soviets of people's deputies. Everything has been put in the hands of the ispolkoms. But the ispolkoms consists of bureaucrats who are subordinate to the executive power, not the regulatory, legislative, real power."

The legal aspects of the functioning of society today were examined in a speech by T. E. Yundzis, deputy chief of the LaSSR Procuracy's General Supervisory Department: "I would like to mention Article 58 of the Soviet Constitution, which grants the right to bring suit against an official. Unfortunately, I must admit that existing laws forbid a great many of our citizens from exercising this constitutional right. Today labor legislation alone lists dozens of categories of workers whose labor disputes are to be reviewed by higher-level organizations. Mention is made of all sorts of administrators, starting with ministers and ending with heads of stores and warehouses, shop foremen, television and radio commentators and a whole series of other workers who do not have the right to take their disputes to court. But are these people not citizens to whom the Constitution is applicable?

"We have great hopes for a new law granting the right to lodge complaints concerning illegal actions by officials. This law took effect on 1 January. Unfortunately, the new law does not do away with existing restrictions. It is virtually inapplicable in our republic. Therefore the idea

of creating a state governed by law—included in the theses of the 19th Party Conference—is one of the conference's most timely ideas.

"The high crime rate in our republic is cause for concern; over the past 25 years it has increased by a factor of more than two. We invite all of society to take part in the struggle against this phenomenon, all writers, journalist and artists."

In addition to analysis, critical comments and a desire simply to speak out, many speakers also made persistent and specific suggestions, realization of which is oriented toward the present day and the short term. The unabridged list of these suggestions is also a means of evaluating the nature and special characteristics of the discussion of the current state of affairs in Latvia which took place at the plenum.

"Currently any citizen of the USSR who receives a job and a residence permit in the LaSSR becomes a citizen of our republic. The granting of citizenship has de facto been left under the incompetent oversight of economic institutions. We need a law on citizenship which will be capable of controlling immigration.

"In order to get people interested in learning a second language we must go from appeals for action to real actions. We should establish a monthly bonus for service workers—salespersons, medical personnel, jurists, militiamen and anyone else whose job involves people—for learning a second language." (proposed by A. Bels)

"If we let Stalin's henchmen, individuals who slandered and tortured people, go unpunished future generations will not forgive us. Criminals should be punished, even if only with a suspended sentence. They should be stripped of their personal pensions and awards." (Ya. Lutsans)

"It is a shame that so much is written in the central press about the Latvians affected by the wave of terror in 1938-39 while not enough is written about this in our own press. Our publications have ignored and refused to print these articles. For example, the biography of Olga Grundmane, the first female Soviet general, who committed suicide in 1931 for reason still unknown, has not been written. This is a woman who deserves to have her story told." (I. Litvinova)

"Next year will be the 125th anniversary of the establishment of the Aynazhi Naval Academy. Among its founders was Krishyanis Valdemar. Until recently Riga had a street named in his honor. That name should be restored to the city." (E. Liv)

"I propose that a bicameral parliament be established. One house would consist of appointed state officials. The other—the people's house - - would consist of representatives of the people, elected by the people. It would also have representatives of all the nationalities living in our republic, for the composition of each republic is a

microcosm of the Soviet Union. This people's house would monitor the other house and its opinion would be required for the passage of every single decision." (A. Yakubans)

"As a measure designed to normalize interethnic relations we should send the active instigators and ideologues of interethnic hostility back to their former place of residence, as provided for in Article 25 of the LaSSR Criminal Code." (A. Kolbergs)

"During the Nazi occupation people were shot at the camp in Yelgave. Many thousands more were sent to camps in Germany and France. Could we finally have an obelisk in memory of those people?" (I. Auzin)

"Our historians continue to claim that collectivization was the best means of developing socialism. As the French say, they keep on playing, afraid of losing. Let us put our cards on the table, then the mystical 'map of the Baltic states' will not be so terrifying. Then there will not be any more witch hunts." (A. L. Klotin)

"This is an abnormal situation: of the 25 deputies who comprise the Commission for the Protection of Socialist Legality and Public Order under the Riga Gorsovet only four are jurists. Therefore I have the following suggestion to make: it should be mandated by law that on permanent commissions no less than one-half of the deputies must be specialists in the corresponding field." (T. Yundzis)

"There are quite a few reasonable individuals in the Latvian emigre community, especially among young people. We should establish contact with them. The majority of them have faith in restructuring. And we should do everything we can to reinforce that faith. We should extend an open, honest hand to them." (P. Petersons)

"We still have farms bearing Zhdanov's name. It is time for that name to be removed." (E. Grinovskis)

"The press should not write in such an infantile manner about the 'calendar disturbances.' Usually three versions as to their origin are circulated: 1) everything was inspired by Western radio broadcasts, 2) supposedly some people want to reestablish a bourgeois state in Latvia or 3) people have not studied enough history in school. The causes lie somewhat deeper than this." (I. Kalninsh)

"Appointments to the highest and slightly lower posts in the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Education and the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting are utterly incomprehensible. I request that on behalf of this plenum a proposal be submitted to the LaSSR CP Central Committee regarding consideration of the suitability, in view of restructuring, of comrades Ya. S. Barkan, A. Ya. Goris and A. A. Buylis for the positions they currently hold." (V. Avotinsh)

"The artistic council that approve new models of consumer goods to be produced in our republic should include people with a good knowledge of the traditions of our national arts and the ethnographic traits of the Latvian people." (V. Kazaks)

"The street in Aluksne currently called Voroshilov Street should be renamed." (P. Bankovskis)

"A museum department should be established for the purpose of collecting and displaying documents on the Stalinist tyranny and preserving the memories of its victims." (A. Litse)

"We also need to consolidate the forces of the scientific-technical intelligentsia. Its forums are also suited to the discussion of pressing problems." (I. Kiyetsis)

It will probably be some time yet before we can reasonably and thoughtfully evaluate everything that was said in the 70 speeches delivered by plenum participants. We should select and realize everything that is more or less useful and constructive and discard those things which are the result of many years of accumulated rage, tentativeness or a narrow world view.

Essentially, this was one of the first experiments with such a broad and multifaceted discussion of our republic's problems at a very representative level under conditions of glasnost. Was this, as chemists would say, a "pure" experiment? Glasnost means criticism, but also self-criticism as well. There was a great deal of the former, and obviously not enough of the latter. Glasnost means comprehensive depiction of a phenomenon. At times it seemed that speakers were looking at the object of their analyses with only one eye, with the other consciously shut. Democratic discussion of any topic should become the norm, but the slightest note of panic can only serve to cause harm, because that has an infectious effect and destroys the harmony of state dialogue.

Nevertheless the experiment was conducted, and we should make use of its findings.

And toward that end let us make one small comment. Unfortunately no press center was set up for journalists, the conduits of glasnost. Basically the journalistic corps operated in a piecemeal fashion, without any opportunity to obtain elementary information or, in particular, even to obtain precise data on the speakers' identities. Our colleagues from Moscow had an especially difficult time of it. The above account was also written completely without the aid of a stenographic record.

Officials Review Latvian Ecology Issues at Press Conference

18300320a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
18 May 88 p 2

[Report on the press conference of the LaSSR Communist Party's Central Committee on ecological problems, by LATINFORM correspondents P.Manko and V.Smirnov: "There Will Be a Tender Rain"]

[Text] Which one of the republic's enterprises is best known today, whose name is on everyone's lips? Do you think it is the "VEF" electronics factory or the "RAF"? No, the winner of the fame contest is a modest, from the economic point of view, Slokskiy Cellulose and Paper Plant. We learned this at the press conference of the LaSSR Communist Party's Central Committee on various questions related to our relationship with the environment. Except its fame is a bad one. It is doubtful that those who founded the plant some 100 years ago were expecting their brainchild to win such laurels. The plant is accused of dumping industrial wastes that pollute the water, the air and the soil—in a word, the environment—in the city of Jurmala and its vicinity. However, it also became clear at the press conference that not everyone is ready to condemn the paper mill. Some defend the it, and their arguments can not be easily dismissed.

Even though the meeting of ministers, agency heads and specialists in ecology on the one hand and journalists from the republic-wide, rayon and city press, LATINFORM, television and radio, as well as Moscow publications, on the other was filled with debate, it was a constructive one. LaSSR Communist Party Secretary A.P.Brill opened the press conference. The first speaker he introduced was the official who stands, so to speak, at the crux of the problem: the LaSSR Council of Ministers' Deputy Chairman, the head of the LaSSR Gosplan M.L.Raman.

Of Plans, Programs and Concepts

"It is a third 5-year plan in a row that takes into consideration protection of the environment and rational use of its resources," said M.L.Raman. "The current 5-year plan has specific targets for the protection of the water, the atmosphere, the soil and the forest and replenishment of natural resources. There is also a more detailed document, an appropriate general plan. Two years ago we developed a plan of action to make the republic's economy produce its most important types of output without generating industrial waste by the turn of the century. To be honest, the implementation of the idea has been proceeding slowly, which is why we should remind people of this resolution more often.

"We are also working on a blueprint for a centralized general program to protect natural resources for the period up to 2005, and for an even longer period as well. We expect to complete the blueprint by the end of next

year. But you, I understand, are more interested in concrete measures in various regions of the republic. Let us take water resources, how they are being protected from pollution. This year, we will open sewage treatment plants in Valka, Valmiyer and Ludz, and next year in Bausk, Kuldig and Rezekna. In 1989, construction will start on a dozen more. The most important are in Tsisis, Ligatna and Sigulda. This means that the water in the Gaua river will get significantly cleaner. We do not intend to slow down in the next 5-year plan, either: 23 additional treatment plants will be built then."

M.L. Roman spoke in more detail about the long-awaited Riga treatment plants. This year marks the 15th anniversary since they were first planned. When the work was under way, it turned out that the Ministry of Health would not allow the plant to be built where it was first planned. As a result, said the speaker, the planning stage extended until 1982. Construction began in another two years. The question where was supplemented by how much. How much will the entire treatment complex cost? The audience was told that currently "a reappraisal for a different sum..., which remains under consideration, is being sought." Nevertheless, the journalists yet again received assurances that the first stage of the treatment complex will be completed in 1990 and the second in 1993.

With respect to protecting air quality, we were told the following: effective gas and dust filtering equipment was installed at the building materials plant in Yeglava and Yekabpils and in such industries as machine building, mixed feeds and utilities. The next 5-year plan provides for 90 million rubles in capital spending for this purpose.

"At the same time, the task of protecting the atmosphere requires serious discussions with our neighbors, in particular with Lithuania," continued the Gosplan chief. "The problem is that according to our biologists' data we get exhausts from the petroleum processing and chemical fertilizer plants in that republic that are far from harmless.

"However, we should not behave like those who see a mote in another's eye but do not notice a log in their own; we must take responsibility for our own woes. In addition to the above-mentioned plans, we have developed detailed programs to protect the environment for Ventspils, Olayna and Jurmala. Incidentally, recent events in the latter resort city have showed that we can act very quickly. In April, a meeting of the USSR Academy of Science's Scientific Bureau Management devoted to problems of its biological environment took place there. Its participants proposed concrete ideas to improve the health of Jurmala.

"The learned guests had barely left, but Latvian specialists were already making use the meeting's recommendations. A draft of the LaSSR Council of Ministers' resolution on that subject was prepared. It would be great if the clean-up of dumping grounds in various

cities, which has been promised at this press conference, were conducted with a similar dispatch and if in the future republic-wide facilities were created to get rid of toxic substances and radioactive wastes. It would also be nice to quickly introduce ecologically safe technologies as well as low-sulfur and low-soot fuels. These and many other proposals were written into the Overview of Economic and Social Development of the LaSSR to 2005."

[Question] "What exactly will be done in Olayna?"

[M.L. Raman] "I am holding a detailed plan which has to be implemented by 1995. It contains some 35 measures. For the current year, for instance, it includes the construction of a furnace for thermal cleanup of condensed wastes at "Latvbiofarm". Systems are being built to capture the rain water at production areas and to channel it to biological cleanup. Before the end of the 5-year plan, we are planning to finish a larger plant for neutralizing chemical reagents. After that, equipment will be installed at the city dump."

A Dusty Business

[Question] "Why does the Council of Ministers put pressure on the Ventspils city ispolkom to violate the program to improve the ecological situation in Ventspils? It happened twice this year, in February and April. At that seaside town, potassium chloride was loaded on ships in conditions in which it is expressly prohibited. For instance, one stormy spring week, when the wind was driving the caustic dust into residential neighborhoods, the ispolkom asked to stop the work at the port. However, the LaSSR Council of Minister's Deputy Chairman O.G. Misurkin ordered the loading to continue, which was done and undoubtedly caused harm to people's health. Moreover, potassium chloride has been shipped for loading after being treated with an efficient dust suppressing agent and not by a substitute. Now, if you were an ispolkom employee, what would you tell the people?"

As it transpired after the press conference, some of its participants did not clearly understand the answer to this question. However, they remembered its joyless ending: "It is very, very, very sad." Consequently, we offer you the results of our own investigation into the February incident:

A seemingly ordinary telegram from the USSR Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production plunged the management of the Ventspils port, as well as city authorities and ordinary citizens, into depression. It announced a shipment to that town of a chemical cargo from the industrial group "Uralkaliy." This would have been a seemingly ordinary fact if it were not for a small detail in the telegram: a considerable part of the potassium chloride had not been treated with polyethylene glycol, a dust suppressant. This was surprising, since at the end of last

year there had been an official announcement that shipments of dust producing potassium chloride, a serious source of air pollution when it is loaded on ships, were terminated.

For many years, Ventpils residents had been sounding alarm because they were suffering from air pollution from various enterprises. All that was recorded in reports of authoritative expert commissions. Their proposals formed the basis for a number of measures to improve the ecological situation in the city which were approved at the end of last year by the USSR Council of Ministers' Deputy Chairman V.K.Gusev. One of the measures called on the Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production to treat potassium chloride with a dust suppressing agent. Until the middle of December, the ministry complied. Yet, the joy of Ventpils residents was premature, and their sigh of relief did not last long. Two months later, the cloud of the hated dust was once again rising on the horizon.

Who was it that violated the USSR Council of Ministers order to improve the ecological situation? That very entity itself did. "Comply!" wrote USSR Council of Ministers' First Deputy Chairman V.S.Murakhovskiy on January 27 on a letter from the USSR Ministry of Internal Economic Relations. That letter asked permission to load the untreated product at Ventpils "because currently, due to the lack of sufficient quantities of the dust suppressant, the loading of potassium chloride for export is being delayed."

Thus, those who sanctioned the violation of the USSR Council of Ministers' order were wrong but, in any case, local authorities, having made the right decision, had to insist on it. It is also clear that the city ispolkom was relying on the support of the leadership of the republic, which displayed its usual deference to the wishes of central authorities.

[Question] In one of your speeches you announced that a nuclear plant site has been selected at Līepāja. Could you specify where exactly the plant will be built and where construction workers and plant personnel will live?

[M.L.Raman] As of now, the definitive decision on that plant has not yet been made. Līepāyskiy rayon has been named tentatively. That location has made energy engineers conduct a very thorough investigation. The decision will be taken once the appropriate energy plan is approved.

[Question] You have said that in the next 5-year plan 23 treatment facilities will be built. Will that plan exist all by itself, and the program Residence 2000 also all by itself, and the plan to build cultural and leisure facilities as well? Each program is very intensive; yet, they have never been considered as interdependent entities. How will you be able to implement everything at once?

[M.L.Raman] "This year, the Ministry of Construction will complete work worth a total of 335 million rubles. We are still discussing next year's target. We will probably agree on 370 million. In the 13th 5-year plan, annual plans will increase further, to over 400 million rubles. By 1995, we will reach 450 rubles. We calculate that this scale will accommodate everything you have mentioned. The important thing is not to exceed the itemized budget.

Games Against Playing Games With Nature

The discussion at the press conference led to the conclusion that the root of various particular problems is in the lack of a republic-wide systematic approach to the bio-social system. But the next speech finally seemed to indicate an attainable possibility in this respect. Here is the transcript of the speech by chief architect of the Latvian State Institute of City Construction Planning, G.I.Poltorak. He also heads Latvia's Comprehensive Local Plan of the Defense of Nature (TERKSOP).

"Forgive me if I start with a criticism. Our plan has been under development since last year and will be completed in the future. We are the last Baltic republic to develop such a plan. This has both negative and positive aspects. A negative is that we have lost time. On the other hand, a consolation is our ability to learn from our neighbors' mistakes and not to repeat them, which will allow us to go farther. We have also encountered difficulties which were unknown to them. For instance, at the outset, our work was not given a status corresponding to its importance. In Lithuania, for example, a special decree of the Communist Party's Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the republic was passed in connection with the development of this plan, and the Gosplan acted as its sponsor. Here, our sponsor is the State Construction Agency, which has immediately lowered the undertaking's prestige. In addition, it took some 6 months to decide on its financing, which caused additional delays.

"TERKSOP focuses on three broad areas: the condition of the environment, the health of the people and industrial activity. In all of them the situation here is not satisfactory.

"Let us take the areas of health. Even small general studies conducted recently have shown that the incidence of disease is rising steadily in nearly every city where there is industry and in villages with developed agribusiness. At the first All-Union Conference on Social Ecology, it was openly said that from the point of view of physical and moral health, the current generation is not overly fortunate. After the most important struggle, for the preservation of peace, the second most important one is for the preservation of the human genetic pool. This is one of the main goals of our comprehensive plan.

"The presence of the environmental component in TERKSOP needs no extensive justifications. We are talking about the contamination of ground and surface

water resources, the poor quality of the air and the soil and animal and plant diseases. Our plan's aim is to save the natural environment of Latvia.

"Finally, a few words about industrial activity. TERKSOP will address such particular characteristics of our republic as its comparative lack of raw materials. Latvia has to import them. However, only 20 percent of the imported materials, at best, is turned into finished products. The rest, in the form of various wastes, finds its way into the air, the water and the soil.

"Today, the question whether or not we can find a way out of the impasse has been answered by the restructuring of our society based on democratization, glasnost and reassessment of economic values."

[Question] Do you have real-life examples of how the advantages that this renewal has given us are being used?

[G.I.Poltorak] The first serious reason for optimism is the attempt to create a new administrative organ democratically. I am talking about the LaSSR State Committee for the Protection of the Environment. Its structure and the list of potential administrators have been proposed by a working group of which I am a member. It includes specialists in different areas of the economy, representatives of the professions and scientists. We are currently trying to set the goals and principles of the committee's work, and our main concern is that it does not become yet another bureaucratic entity, but be a true working organization.

In answer to your question I would like to point out that we have started to look differently at the concept of using natural resources. I am emphasizing the word using. If we used nature intelligently, secondary questions of protection, restoration and salvation would not arise. This task requires efforts of many organizations and specialists, from Gosplan managers to average medical workers: how to tap their skills and arouse their interest?

We have decided to do so with the help of so-called goal-oriented games. We will stage them in October and November in Jurmala. We will try to draw in as many participants as possible and pit different ideas one against the other. I would like to use this opportunity to ask for your help, journalists. Solutions discovered during those discussions should be broadly publicized by the mass media. After that, they could become subject of a broadly based discussion, which would help us arrive at a general concept of optimal use of Latvia's natural resources.

Replying to other questions, G.I.Poltorak pointed out that, as lawyers agree and many practical examples show, existing ecological laws are highly ineffective. This is why those who created TERKSOP are also trying to change the legal aspect of environmental protection. It has long been necessary to regulate the relationship between those who own natural resources and those who

use them. The assessment of the damage in cases when the soil, the water, the rivers and the forest, as well as the atmosphere above them, are harmed has not been objective, to put it mildly. Existing fines do not compensate for the losses.

In the future, the plan will develop in two directions: upward, to join in with other regional plans of the Baltic region (since national boundaries do not exist in nature) and downward, to the level of individual rayons of the republic where ecological conditions are particularly unfavorable and where consequences are most disturbing.

Some Old Problems of a New Agency

"I hope that the comprehensive local plan will some day become the strategic foundation of our work," said P.Z.Ziedinsh, chairman of the LaSSR Committee for the Protection of the Environment. "Our agency, which with the help of the LaSSR Communist Party's Central Committee is currently being organized on democratic principles, is at a growth stage; yet, the character of its future activities and many of the activities themselves are quite clear. First of all, we will implement decisions that have already been taken. But at the same time, we will be ready to implement a fundamentally new ecological policy and learn to view environmental protection as a system.

"One of our tasks will be to develop ecologically safe production methods. We are far behind, as far as technology is concerned. As a result, the idea of ecologically safe production methods, well known and popular in developed countries, has not yet taken root here. Here, we are concerned with cleaning the drain water, while we should be implementing measures to make sure that wastes, which are actually left-over raw materials, do not get into the water.

"But let us come back to earth. While we are on the subject of protection of water resources: this is one of the most neglected areas. It will take a long time to rectify the results of the so-called profit policy which has been pursued for decades. Given the scarcity of natural resources, bureaucrats were forever forcing production without giving a thought for consequences. Judge for yourselves: the Riga treatment facilities, officially classified as one of the most important new construction projects in Latvia, were financed on a left-over principle until last year. This was the case elsewhere in the republic as well."

[Question] Who was it that approved and was implementing this left-over principle?

[P.Z.Ziedinsh] As you know, it is a hard question. In general, the policy was set by high-level organizations, the Gosplan and the Council of Ministers.

[Question] Fines levied for polluting the environment add up to a considerable sum. How are they used? Could those funds be invested in the construction and improvement of treatment plants? Or would the cause be better served if those funds were transferred to your agency?

[P.Z.Ziedinsh] The recipient of those sums is known. Latvia is the second republic after Estonia to establish an Environmental Defense Fund. It currently contains about 7.2 million rubles of fine-generated funds. How the funds accrue and are used is determined by the commission of the LaSSR Council of Ministers' Presidium on Environmental Protection and Rational Use of Natural Resources. These sums finance environmental protection projects, but only ones that do not fall under the responsibility of some other entity. For example, the funds can not be invested into treatment facilities since plants themselves are required to build them.

However, those funds were very useful when the coastline of reservoirs along the Daugava river needed to be fortified. The Fund's money is also used to purchase lab equipment. It pays for scientific research studies contracted outside.

[Question] It is known that there are large quantities of various dangerous chemicals in the republic, both wastes and raw materials. What can be done about this collection?

[Answer] This is a festering problem and, being aware of it, we can not go on hiding our heads in the sand. At factories, large quantities of toxic industrial wastes have accumulated. They have been stored there for years and even decades, and there is no guarantee against disaster. Yet, no special sites to bury toxic materials have been set up. As a result, by various dubious methods, covertly, at night, these dangerous cargoes are often transported and dumped God knows where. And what is happening on the countryside? Practically every farm has an ancient shed where toxic chemicals, some long barred from use, are stored.

All this serves as a constant reminder that there is an urgent need to establish special storage sites for such substances, to destroy them or make use of them in the future. It is difficult to find a suitable location. Toxic wastes should not be allowed to seep into the ground, get into the air or be washed away by floods or rains from the trap. Today I can announce that such a location has been found. To equip it properly will be expensive, but the liquidation of these dangerous stores must not be delayed any longer.

[Question] Our lakes are in a sad condition. Many of them have silted and can no longer be used for recreation or fishing. Is the state committee planning a program to clean them up?

[P.Z.Ziedinsh] No special program has been developed, but we understand the importance of the problem. We are going to address it in conjunction with the Gosagroprom. The silt that pollutes waterways is a valuable fertilizer.

[Question] The head of the city branch of the Society for the Protection of Nature and Monuments and deputy chairman of the ispolkom are usually one and the same person. Experience has shown, repeatedly and everywhere, that such a situation inevitably constrains the organization's initiative and independence. Will the creation of a new agency help the Society's branches regain their independence?

This question P.Z.Ziedinsh passed on to Deputy Chairman of the LaSSR Society for the Protection of Nature and Monuments I.P.Puteklis who sat in the presidium of the press conference. Yet, the chairman made not reply. And no other question was addressed to him, even though judging by his title he should have been the most competent and the most deeply involved official at the press conference.

If You Wish to Be Healthy

First Deputy Minister of Health, LaSSR chief sanitation inspector V.Ye.Derkach walked to the podium holding an entire stack of written questions that usually come from the audience during the speech. This alone underscored the intense interest in medical aspects of the subject. The connection between one's own health and that of nature concerns every reader directly.

The first question was asked about perils presented by nitrates in vegetables, something that has recently become a common concern. The head of the republic's sanitation inspection service answered it in considerable detail:

"Nitrates are poisonous. In the first place, they affect the health of children. However, their effects begin only at a certain dosage. Consequently, a moderate use of fertilizers containing those substances causes no harm. To obtain larger yields, however, given our shortage of sunny days, both state farms and private growers often oversaturate the soil with nitrates. Last year, the Gosagroprom and our organization passed a resolution requiring all vegetable products grown by state agricultural entities to be provided with a certificate. The certificate must contain information on the type and quantity of fertilizers used to grow the given load of cucumbers, parsley, salad greens, onions and other vegetables.

"However, I have data showing that some farms, sovkhov 'Riga' among them, have provided inaccurate certificates. Every market should have its own lab, since our employees visit them only periodically. The Gosagroprom should also make sure that every kolkhoz and sovkhov has a lab to check the nitrate content of food

products. This can, and should, be done before harvesting. In open fields, tests should be conducted 15 days before the crops mature, and in green houses a week before. It is also time to require owners of private plots who sell their produce at the market to provide such certificates. Certificates could be issued by local sanitation and epidemiological centers (SES), which are currently switching to self-financing."

[Question] Why is the veterinary service responsible for vegetables sold at the market?

[V.Ye.Derkach] Because the labs belong to the veterinary service of the Gosagroprom.

[Question] Thus, the labs belong to an agency that could hardly be expected to enforce strict controls. In other words, tests will come out exactly as the agency wants them to come out, right?

[V.Ye.Derkach] I agree with you. The inspection service should not belong to any agency but be independent, like *gospriyemka*. Currently, the quality of vegetables is checked by one agency, that of milk by another, and the purity of water is certified by yet another entity. And so on, everywhere.

[Question] Why is the sanitation inspection service so timid whenever the question of shutting down a plant comes up?

[V.Ye.Derkach] Indeed, we have had no sensational cases, such as the one in Ladoga, for instance. But I would like to ask you what happened to the inspector who closed down the plant there? Did he get a medal? You do not know? Neither do I. Yet, now, there has been talk that he should not have done it, since there are shortages of paper as it is.

I just want to note that we should not always go after well-publicized victories. Thus, we should not insist on closing the Slokskiy paper mill or a large plant producing drugs that are in short supply. An entire resort or a large plant attract immediate attention, of course. But one could start by taking a close look at the courtyard of the house where one lives. This is where all our troubles begin. The trash that lies there and the rats that run around there are not the fault of sanitation authorities but tenants themselves.

[Question] We were surprised to find your signature on two documents. One is an inspection commission report which concluded that the Slokskiy plant must stop cellulose production. The other one, issued three months later, declared that it does not have to stop production, only that certain measures should be taken. How do you explain so radical a change of heart in so short a time?

[V.Ye.Derkach] The fact is that we have great shortages of toilet paper. I have been asked many times whether ecological tests have been conducted at the plant. Should

it be allowed to function in its present condition? No. This is the reason why I signed the first report. But things change. Later, it was decided to allocate funds for additional treatment facilities and a sanitary buffer zone, among other things. I believe that once these measures are implemented the plant could continue to function. For your information, the famous European resort Baden Baden has a similar plant. There, for some reason, such problems do not arise.

[Question] Does the Ministry of Health have concrete data on harmful effects of swimming in the Riga Bay? If so, why no warnings have been issued at resorts? Why are there no signs banning swimming at the most polluted areas, at the mouth of the Lielupe river?

[V.Ye.Derkach] What do you mean, no signs? It is well known that swimming is not allowed in the Lielupe river. Consequently, there is no swimming at its mouth, either.

As to concrete data on harmful effects of swimming in the sea, there is none yet. We have secured the participation of specialists from the Riga Medical Institute, the LaSSR Academy of Science's Biology Institute and other organizations to study the impact of the condition of the water and the air on general disease statistics.

The work of those, whose job it is to study what we breathe, was described by LaSSR chief state inspector of atmospheric protection D.I.Veretennikov:

"In practice, our responsibilities exceed our capabilities. Let me explain this. It is our responsibility to enforce the Law on the Protection of the Atmosphere. In theory, we have the right to punish its violators by all available means, including plant closings. Yet, the smokestacks of most large enterprises, and of a good many of the rest, continue to pump harmful exhausts without permission. And many of those who do get permission exceed set limits. The situation with motor vehicles is no better.

"Why is this happening, you may well ask. Judge for yourselves: the inspection commission concluded that the firing shop of the Riga cement and roofing slate plant should be temporarily closed, starting June 1988. However, the plant decided to pay its way out of it: the shop continues to operate while we are left filling out more fine slips. Naturally, the air does not get any cleaner from this."

[Question] How many smokestacks in Riga still lack smoke filters?

[D.I.Veretennikov] Most of them, if we count chimneys and motor vehicle exhaust pipes. Not all of them need filtering devices. Yet, some 200 smokestacks that must have filters do not have them yet.

Responding to other questions, the state inspector told the journalists that a number of shops producing enormous quantities of smoke will either be redesigned or move out of Riga.

Director of the LaSSR Nature Museum V.K.Kruminsh shared his thoughts on how the nation's perestroyka will be reflected in ecological policy. State agencies would become kinder to nature and to those who take interest in its fate. But, noted that experienced and respected specialist, many officials find it difficult to see their narrow professional responsibilities in the context of the entire nature and industry complex.

Proposals, Arguments and Discussions

Of course, it is impossible to ask every festering question in a mere three hours. And not all questions that were asked were adequately answered. And some had to be left out of this report.

Some questions could actually be called proposals:

To declare Jurmala an official resort city, which it has been for a long time, in all but name.

To involve Riga enterprises whose employees vacation in Jurmala in improving the town's services and in protecting its environment. Large enterprises could also provide funds to repair the damage done to that unique natural spot. To do so, sections of the Jurmala coast could be assigned to various enterprises that will take care of them.

To publish a specialized magazine on ecological problems.

To conduct ecological tests on all new construction projects.

To develop a special long- and short-term ecological forecast and to report it along with weather forecasts.

This is only a sampling of proposed ideas and opinions. We have not mentioned specific problems of some towns and enterprises which could be solved by local authorities and the public. The participants of the press conference did not agree on everything: for instance, whether or not herbicides are harmful. This question does not have a simple yes-or-no answer. It depends which herbicides. The ones we have now are undoubtedly harmful. There are, however, types of herbicides which, having fulfilled their function of protecting cultivated plants from weeds, break down to basic elements which are harmless to both humans and the environment.

Or here is another problem. Which is more important: residential buildings or treatment facilities, which are both priorities. Which should be funded first? People need in equal measure a comfortable apartment and the

common house, i.e., nature that surrounds us. Something must be sacrificed for the time being. It is important not to make a secret of it but to discuss the decision openly with the people, one way or another. This is relevant to other subjects as well, not just to funding priorities.

While we were writing this article, we often thought of the animated cartoon "There Will Be a Tender Rain." This is why we chose this title for our article. The cartoon shows the tragedy threatening the human race if we turn away from the natural world in favor of a blind technical civilization. This, actually, is a very crude description, since the cartoon, like any good work of art, is subject to different interpretations. While they agree that it is one of the best Soviet animated features, critics and the public leave the theater with different opinions, each with his own. Some are thinking about the warm rain that will be falling when they are no longer alive. Others are depressed over the prospect of a self-inflicted destruction of the human race. Still others, the optimists, go away in a hopeful mood. The long discussion of the fate of nature in Latvia has also engendered contradictory opinions and feelings. Still, optimists were in a majority.

12892

Chairman on Plans of Latvian Environmental Protection Committee

18300320b Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Jun 88 p 3

[Interview with Chairman of the LaSSR State Committee for the Protection of the Environment P.Z.Ziedinsh by E.Lapidus: "The Most Difficult Task Lies Ahead" under the "June 5, the International Environmental Protection Day" heading; first two paragraphs are a boldface introduction]

[Text] On the second floor of the building housing the LaSSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, on the door of one office, a name plate has recently appeared. It reads, in both Russian and Latvian: Chairman of the LaSSR State Committee for the Protection of the Environment P.Z.Ziedinsh. The office has become the focus of the republic's ecological problems.

On the occasion of the International Environmental Protection Day, P.Ziedinsh was interviewed by a SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA correspondent.

[Question] A little more than a month has passed since you have been given this appointment. How do you feel in your new capacity?

[Answer] Like between two millstones. On one side, there are growing requirements of the economy. On the other, a rapidly accelerating popular movement in the republic demanding to limit harmful effects of agribusiness and industry on the environment and to quickly

resolve the problems accumulated during the last 3 or 4 5-year plans. These are the conditions in which we must set the best possible strategy and tactics for the state committee.

[Question] We know that the process of selecting the head of the new state committee did not follow usual procedures.

[Answer] Indeed, I have not heard of another such example. The LaSSR Communist Party's Central Committee proposed appointing a working group. It was comprised of scientists and representatives of party and public organizations. The group held discussions and selected a candidate. The selection was approved by the Council of Ministers of the republic. On April 29, the LaSSR Council of Ministers' Presidium passed a decree appointing the Chairman of the State Committee for the Protection of the Environment.

[Question] The State Committee for the Protection of the Environment is a new type of organization both in the country and in the republic. How is it structured?

[Answer] The working group, which is still functioning, has not yet finalized the committee's structure. For now, the following idea seems practical: the committee will have a managerial board, which will function much like the managerial board at any ministry. The board is an administrative entity. It will be comprised of State Committee management and representatives of organizations we work with. The next link will be a public advisory board comprised of leading specialists in ecology, representatives of the Society for the Protection of Nature and Monuments and other social and youth organizations. The board will help us make all decisions.

We cannot do without pure science. The question is how to tie it with the real world. We are planning to set up an ecological research center under the aegis of the Academy of Science of the republic. The state committee will contract the center to conduct various studies. Great hopes rest on this project.

This is an approximate sketch of what the top layer of the state committee will look like.

Three main components and one support function follow. The first component, the brain center that will set the strategy, will comprise the task of economic management as well as of managing scientific progress and setting ecological norms.

The second component will consist of control and inspection functions. Its immediate responsibility will be to protect the water, the air, the soil, the flora and the fauna. The third component will be comprised of two parts: ecological studies on the one hand and ecological propaganda and education of the people on the other. The support function means accounting, personnel services, etc.

The committee's staff will number 90 to 95 employees. Of these, 60 to 65 will be professional employees.

[Question] Will you have representatives in other regions of the republic?

[Answer] The plan calls for creating eight regional centers of environmental protection. The network will be set up on an administrative pool principle: for instance, the Ventspils Center will pool together Venspils, Talsi and Tukums.

[Question] Peteris Ziedonovich, please describe your budget, rights and short- and long-term goals.

[Answer] The budget, as well as location, remain undetermined. It depends what other agencies would be transferred to us. This has not been decided yet. I can only tell you that we will administer the republic's Environmental Defense Fund. Today it has 7.5 million rubles.

We have broad rights. We report directly to the government of the republic and to the USSR State Committee for the Protection of the Environment. Our decisions are binding for all ministries and agencies of the republic. Since we are part of the USSR State Committee for the Protection of the Environment network, all dismissals of specialists must be approved by them. This factor, I think, is rather important, since it means that brave and principled employees are safe from the wrath of any local bureaucrat.

Our immediate goal is to start up regional centers as soon as possible. Their task is to enforce environmental protection legislation, which is currently done very poorly: exceptions are permitted everywhere, so that they have by now become the rule, unfortunately. Everyone must strictly obey the laws. Here, we do not need any capital investments; yet, returns will be considerable.

The long-term goal is clear enough. We must work to develop ecologically safe production methods. Here, our ecological research will be very useful. We are currently trying to come up with ways to clean up polluted drain water, even though it is only a consequence. The true task is to eliminate the cause: the drain water should not be polluted in the first place. For this we need advanced pollution-free technologies.

[Question] Does the committee run the risk of becoming yet another agency breeding orders and directives and gathering unneeded reports?

[Answer] This was one of the doubts expressed by scientists in the working group. What can I say? As in any other agency, such trends could emerge here. Everything depends on the staff of the agency. We will try to staff the central office and regional centers with young, competent specialists. The republic has highly competent specialists in all required areas. There is a large pool

to choose from. Enough dealing with amateurs. Our employees, in addition to specialized knowledge, must be able to work with people, be not only principled but tolerant as well and be able to explain various ecological problems in a generally accessible way.

[Question] The CPSU Central Committee's Theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference declare: "One of our main goals is to intensify efforts to protect the environment and to implement comprehensive measures to radically improve the ecological situation in the country." In your opinion, how should these proposals be implemented in Latvia?

[Answer] The fact that the CPSU Central Committee's Theses contain a statement on the ecology is telling in and of itself. I have already mentioned some aspects of the task. I will add only that a situation whereby environmental protection work is funded on a left-over basis is intolerable. Here is another problem. In the past 10 years, the LaSSR Council of Ministers has passed 6 resolutions to build treatment plants in Riga. Finally, the last one is being implemented. However, no one has studied the question why this happened. We hope to change the existing practice. Furthermore, every new structure should be equipped with a proper environmental protection system. This has to become a factor limiting pollution. I see no other solution.

Here is another locus of problems. Some 27 towns are unable to provide sewage treatment facilities. How can this problem be reconciled with new residential construction? Apparently, without first building treatment plants we can not fulfill the Residence 2000 program. Consequently, local soviets should patiently explain the people the importance of such projects, and not refer all public complaints to sanitation and environmental protection services, as it is being done even now.

[Question] Public opinion in the republic is concerned about conditions at Jurmala, the Riga Bay, Olayne and the Lielupe river. The Slokskiy paper mill remains the center of controversy. Will the state committee be able to help improve the situation in these ecological crisis zones?

[Answer] Let us draw the lines here. The state committee's function is not to build environmental protection facilities. We will use our authority to make sure that ministries, agencies and organizations, with the help of local soviets, build such facilities. In general, however, the improvement of the environmental situation will greatly depend on when the Riga treatment facilities are completed. If the latest resolution of the LaSSR Council of Ministers is carried out, an improvement in the ecological situation could be expected only by 1995, when the Riga treatment facilities will operate at full capacity. Until then, one may expect that the situation in Jurmala and in the Riga Bay may even worsen.

Let me say a few words about the Slokskiy paper mill. As a citizen, I feel that there is no place for it at a resort town. As an official, I must take into account economic considerations. This means that we should wait and see how successfully measures recommended by the USSR Ministry of Forest Industry are implemented. Nevertheless, if by July 1, 1988, the Slokskiy paper mill does not meet the standards set by the first stage of the ecological plan, we will shut down cellulose production.

[Question] The state committee and the society...

[Answer] ...Must work closely together. In fact, this is reflected in our structure. In addition to the public advisory board, we have plans to publish a popular journal. We also have plans to study public opinion on a regular basis, and in our work we will of course be guided by that data. We are also ready to support unofficial groups, such as the environmental protection club, as long as its goal is ecology, and other social entities which promote careful attitude to nature.

[Question] What would you like to wish to all defenders of the environment?

[Answer] We have started to talk a great deal about ecological problems, but there have been few practical deeds. I call on everyone to find his place in the ecosystem and to assess his actions from that perspective. I am sure that if everyone said to himself: "I won't pour motor oil into the sand, I won't litter in the woods or on the beach, I will stop those who perpetrate barbaric actions against plants," we would quickly solve half of all the problems. This must be done today. Tomorrow may be too late.

12892

Azerbaijani Official on Plans to Improve Publishing for NKAO

*18300302a Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
4 Jun 88 pp 2-3*

[Statement given by N. Ibragimov, chairman of the AzSSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, to BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY correspondent A. Kyazimzade under the rubric "Because of a Paragraph in the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Decree": "It will Be Published in the NKAO"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On measures to accelerate the socioeconomic development of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR in the 1988-1995 Period" provides for a combination of measures to re-equip the printing facilities of the NKAO and increase the publication of literature in the Armenian language.

N. Ibragimov, chairman of the AzSSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, tells a BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY correspondent about this.

We have worked out and approved a purposeful plan of measures in the collegium for the 1988-1990 period and the further outlook up to 1995. It should be stated that our efforts met with interested understanding in the USSR Goskomizdat. At the beginning of April, together with M. Shishigin, a member of the USSR Goskomizdat Collegium sent especially to Azerbaijan, we visited Stepanakert, as a result of which the plan cited was defined specifically, taking into account the wishes expressed during the course of discussions with the leadership of the party obkom.

Certain practical results of the steps undertaken are already at hand. After approving our suggestions, the USSR Goskomizdat allocated a significant amount of printing equipment, both domestic and imported, specifically for the NKAO. This will make it possible to publish the oblast periodicals by the most up-to-date offset method and to substantially improve the quality of the newspapers and books published.

But after the new printing facility is put into operation in the oblast center, of course. The point is that careful study of the situation on the spot suggests that it is advisable not to renovate, as noted in the decree, but to build a new printing house in Stepanakert with a capacity of 20 million sheet-copies annually. The oblast newspapers and all the rayon newspapers in the autonomous oblast, as well as books and pamphlets in the Armenian language, will be printed here to provide the population with the necessary literature.

It should be stated that the matter is still being decided. A. Levin, chief project engineer of the Tashkent affiliate of the State Planning and Scientific Research Institute for the Overall Planning of Printing Industry Enterprises, and a group of our specialists, together with gorispolkom representatives, selected and assigned a site for construction of the printing facility in Stepanakert. In addition, all the necessary information for the project planning, which will be speeded up, has been provided by the city authorities, and there is every reason to assume that the combined operations necessary will be fully completed by the end of this year.

This is extremely important to stress, because under the agreement with the republic Gosplan, the printing plant has been included in the construction plan for 1989.

We expect construction to be completed in 1990, that is, ahead of the schedule planned. At the same time, it is

important to note that the Stepanakert printing complex should be one of the largest in the region, according to our preliminary outlines.

But to finish here, in my view, would be to stop halfway. Looking to the near future, we propose to establish a Nagorno-Karabakh Printing Association of the AzSSR Goskomizdat, just as in the Nakhichevan ASSR, incidentally.

But since this is prospective and the NKAO's requirements for literature are urgent and growing with each day, we believe that it is advisable at this time to establish a single organization here for the dissemination of printed materials. In the meantime, this important work is being carried out by two republic organizations—"Azerkitab" in Stepanakert and Shusha, and "Azerittifak" in the rural localities. We are proposing that these efforts be combined, and we hope that putting the question this way will meet with understanding and support.

Taking the requests and wishes of the oblast organizations concerned into account and in implementing the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree with respect to the NKAO, we have outlined a number of additional measures which are timely. Thus, for example, we are thinking of opening book centers and establishing library book distribution offices in Stepanakert and Shusha. The republic's publishing houses have been ordered to verify the availability of manuscripts by Armenian authors in the editorial offices and production facilities and to make specific suggestions for their inclusion in future publication plans.

In this connection, I particularly want to focus attention on the translation and publication of textbooks, primarily those in the ideological disciplines and for the 6-year-old first graders, in the Armenian language. At the same time, similar questions have been asked with regard to the Azerbaijani schools located in the Armenian SSR and about what arrangement may be reached between the "Maarif" and "Luys" publishing houses at the management level of the Goskomizdat and the public education ministries of the two fraternal republics.

The fairs and exhibitions of books in the Russian, Azerbaijani and Armenian languages which we are proposing in Baku, Yerevan and Stepanakert may and should contribute to a successful resolution of the problems outlined in the decree as well. The Transcaucasian Wholesale Book Fair which is opening in Baku on 24 June, in which both the Georgian and our Armenian partners have confirmed that they would participate, may become a prototype for them.

More on Uzbek Intersovkhoz Feud, Police Injuries
18300302b Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 88 p 4

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent S. Pastukhov datelined Samarkand-Tashkent-Moscow: "On the Monday After Friday: On the Events in the Village of Dzhumabazar in Samarkand Oblast"; for previous reporting on this subject, see pages 52-53 of the JPRS series SOVIET UNION: POLITICAL AFFAIRS, JPRS-UPA-88-024, dated 1 July 1988]

[Text] Nigora Sherbabayeva, a 10th-grade student at the 107th Secondary School in the village of Dzhumabazar in Samarkandskiy Rayon, was invited at my request to the Russian language study room (another room was not available at that moment). She arrived shortly thereafter, and when I saw her I automatically wondered: this must be a mistake—is that the person they asked to come?

Although Nigora had already reached the age when a southerner is customarily considered a grown-up young woman, she gave the impression that she was still a girl in the fifth or sixth grade. Frail in her black uniform pinafore, her large black eyes showing her fright, she stirred a feeling in my heart that was difficult to define in one word, but which became more and more apparent after that.

Although Nigora was just about to take her final examinations and although she had received mostly grades of "four" and "five," she could not speak with me without an interpreter: she has a poor command of Russian, and I, being in her part of the country for the first time, do not know Uzbek. Our intermediaries were I. Isakov, first secretary of the the party's Samarkand Raykom; A. Usmonov, former principal of the school who recently lost this position together with his party membership, and a history and social science teacher; A. Safarov, the student's class teacher; and other persons. With their assistance, I managed to hear the girl's story and how she "had been arrested and put in jail."

This happened on Saturday, 9 April, during a parade in the schoolyard. They suddenly called Nigora into the teachers room, where the district militia officer and some other man ordered her to come to the local militia office in the afternoon "to give testimony." The class teacher took the girl there. There she wrote down "everything as it happened," but they asked the class teacher to bring her again the following morning.

On the next day, Sunday 10 April, teacher A. Safarov and Nigora's mother took her again to the office, where persons she did not know asked her several questions:

"Were you on the bank of the canal?"

"Yes, I was, together with everyone..."

"Did you throw stones?"

"No, I did not throw any, I just watched..."

At that time, on a Sunday, they took the schoolgirl away from the village to Samarkand—without her teacher and her mother. Under escort. For 10 days. In that sense, we can say that the person sitting before me was not a "young girl." A "hooligan" was sitting before me. I asked Nigora what she intends to do after she finishes school. Covering her face with her little ink-stained hands, she burst into bitter tears...

Then, after Nigora left, an elderly woman about my age came into the room. While standing, she began giving some kind of speech, only one word of which I understood: "rakhmat" (thank you). The intermediaries explained: the woman's name is Khosiyat Sodikova, a mother-heroine, a teacher in this school who is already on a pension but continues to teach. She is thanking the party and the Soviet Government for leading her, a simple Uzbek woman, out on the path of happiness—they gave her a higher education, and they gave her the most honorable work... And suddenly, as if to repeat the movement of the person we had talked with before, she sat down on a students bench and began crying, bemoaning something.

The intermediaries continued interpreting: Nigora is her daughter, the most obedient of her 10 children who has never offended anyone. She has another daughter, Mubarro, who is also a teacher and a correspondence student at the pedagogical institute, married and mother of three small children—Khosiyat's grandchildren, and is pregnant with a fourth child. Mubarro's husband was away, and she was visiting her mother. Suddenly helmeted militiamen with dogs burst into Khosiyat's yard. They turned the entire house upside down—they were looking for the master of the house, but they could not find him and they took Mubarro away with them. Though they released her, the pregnant woman, by evening. After the daughter returned she grabbed her little children and ran home to her house. Now the grandchildren don't go to see their grandmother—they are afraid...

Another woman, advanced in years, entered the room. It later turned out that she was also a mother-heroine. Without speaking, she turned over a sheet of notebook paper entitled "Arznoma" (complaint). Here is a translation of it in abbreviated form:

"Life has become very difficult for me over the past month and a half. The militia don't give me a moment's peace. For a month and a half the militiamen have burst into my house about 10 times at midnight or later. Twice they came with three dogs. The other times about 10 or 15 persons came and threw the blankets and pillows into a heap. On the night of 12 May, the militiamen jumped over the fence into our yard. My sons-in-law, one daughter, my daughter-in-law and her two daughters were sleeping in the house. They turned everyone out on the street. They demanded that I find my husband, but I haven't seen him since 4 April. I have never experienced such humiliation in all my life..."

Teachers at the village's kindergarten No 3 also complained to me. M. Sattorova (mother of five, party member, and correspondence student at a school for training preschool teachers) said that once the kindergarten was surrounded by up to 50 militiamen, some of whom were wearing helmets and carrying rubber batons and others who were accompanied by police dogs. The principal, M. Rustamova, did not allow the militia to enter the kindergarten with the dogs. The teachers took the children's hands and walked home with them. But the militia entered the kindergarten just the same (without the dogs, though) and searched it "from top to bottom." They were looking for men—the husbands and relatives of the teachers, but those who could had escaped.

"My husband," S. Akhmedova said, "had moved into a tree to live, and he slept there, not in the house..."

Just what did the husbands and fathers, the men of the village of Dzhumabazar, do? Why did they begin searching so persistently and intensively for them, and why should their children and wives suffer?

I had met some of these men in February 2 years ago. At that time, during the 27th party congress, a group of old men from Dzhumabazar—messengers from the village, unofficial delegates—had set off for Moscow after the Uzbek and other official delegates. They did not get into the overcrowded Great Kremlin Palace, and for that reason they went to PRAVDA with a collective letter from their fellow villagers. Among the visitors was an old Uzbek language and literature teacher from School No 107, pensioner Imom Sherbabayev—the father of 10th-grader Nigora and the husband of her mother, whom we met in the Russian language room; Saidkul Toshov, a former fitter, disabled veteran of the Great Patriotic War, and husband of the second mother-heroine who authored the "arznoma," was also there. Since that time, they and their comrades have been regularly visiting Moscow or writing to the editorial staff. What is the nature of their problem?

The third section of Dzhumabazar's "Leninabad" Sovkhoz—it is basically its residents who have been complaining—was an independent kolkhoz at one time. In the early 1950's they had combined the kolkhoz with two such farms, forming the sovkhoz named above. Then they created the "Bagizagan" ("Sparrow Garden") Sovkhoz, where the Dzhumabazar residents went as to the section under the previous name of "Leninabad." Later they broke up the "Bagizagan" into smaller units and the "Leninabad" was again separated into a single unit. Later something else, and so on...

They consolidated, separated, divided and cut out the people, land, livestock and equipment "at someone's will." The expression I am using here is that of M. Khalilov, head of the agriculture and food industry department of the Samarkand Obkom and recently first secretary of the party's Samarkandskiy Raykom, whom

the obkom bureau had given a severe reprimand, entered in his registration form in his new position, "for the past." His successor, the former chairman of the rayispolkom who is already well-known to the reader, I. Isakov, also received the same party punishment. And also "for the past," although they have less than 2 years each of this "past" in Samarkandskiy Rayon. Both of them are resentful, they say, inasmuch as they had to answer for "someone else's faults."

As far back as about 8 years ago—long before Khalilov and Isakov—the residents of Dzhumabazar complained to the rayispolkom and the party raykom that their village had lost 430 hectares of land as the result of the "consolidations and separations." These lands—just beyond the Dargom Canal—were transferred to the ownership of the "Almazar" ("Apple Blossom") Sovkhoz. Can't they be given back? The families are growing and the labor force is growing, but there is nowhere to work.

They turned down the Dzhumabazar residents in their own rayon. Then they appealed to their oblispolkom, the obkom, and the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and the UzSSR Council of Ministers. They began asking the question somewhat differently: if there is no possibility of returning the lands, they can be joined with the "Almazar," after all—they worked together with its people before, they said...

Newspapers are not engaged in land distribution, and PRAVDA turned to the local organs. P. Abdurakhmanov, former secretary of the Samarkand Obkom of the party, stated that "residents of the "Leninabad" Sovkhoz have no grounds for demanding the return of 430 hectares of land from the "Almazar" Sovkhoz. And in general, he said, there are no reasons for complaints, inasmuch as the Dzhumabazar residents have more than enough land. The "Leninabad" Sovkhoz has 2,400 hectares of agricultural land and another 150 hectares was assigned to the farm from the Sovkhoz imeni 50th Anniversary of the USSR by a decision of the Samarkand Rayispolkom. On the whole, it turned out that this is roughly 2.5 times more than the "Almazar" Sovkhoz had.

"We don't have so much land—we have 2.5 times less of it," they disagreed at the "Leninabad" Sovkhoz.

The editorial staff of PRAVDA asked I. Usmankhodzhayev, the first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee (also a former secretary now) personally to look closely into the complaint by the Dzhumabazar residents that their land had been seized, as well as the red tape, bureaucratism, and a number of abuses by local organs... The man from Tashkent corrected the man from Samarkand: the residents of Dzhumabazar have only 930 hectares of agricultural land, but as far as abuses are concerned, there are none! The man from Tashkent also flatly rejected the Dzhumabazar residents' demands. It's impossible, nothing is allowed! Rashidov

said this before. His successor (now a man from Moscow) said it later. "But perhaps everything is possible for them themselves?" the messengers asked me.

Early last spring the persons from Dzhumabazar went again to Samarkand and Tashkent. Again they reached the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee. They "turned them over" to be received by the chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, G. Kadyrov.

"I received the delegation from Dzhumabazar on 4 March," G. Kadyrov told me, "and promised to give them an answer in no later than a month."

And he gave it—not a day later!..

"We have known Comrade Kadyrov for a long time. We saw him in Tashkent, and he has visited us in Dzhumabazar," retired teacher Imom Sherbabayev and disabled pensioner Saidkul Toshob told me in Moscow when they came to PRAVDA again before the May Day holidays, "but we never thought that he was bad..."

"Why 'bad'?"

"He sent us a dishonest letter..."

The 10th-grader Nigora, daughter of the first old man, I repeat, had been "in jail," and three sons of the second old man, I will add, were arrested, and the messengers themselves, as I learned when I arrived in Samarkand, were thought to be in hiding and "have been put under investigation"...However, I will continue the chronicle of events firsthand in Dzhumabazar.

Two weeks after the messengers met in Tashkent with the head of the republic's government, a representative commission arrived in the village. After drinking green tea and "shuffling papers" in the office, it left the same day without saying anything clearly to the people. And the sun became hotter and hotter each morning, but there still was no definite answer, and after waiting until the end of the 1-month period that had been set, about 30 persons from the "Leninabad" Sovkhoz crossed the canal, seeing that they had repaired it and there was no water.

The Rubicon was crossed on 28 March.

The persons from Dzhumabazar began walking around the vineyards and gardens spontaneously, as some people describe their actions, after recovering their former lands, or, as other persons describe it, after willfully seizing and occupying other persons' lands. The "invaders" themselves told me that they did neither one thing or the other—they "were united" with their neighbors once again, they said, to help them in the spring work... The children—the students, including Nigora and her classmates—also crossed the canal with the adults. It was the spring vacation.

Soon after, the militiamen arrived "on the other bank," but they did not succeed in driving away the "invaders." Water was to have been released into the "dry" canal, and the people from Dhumabazar decided to build a bridge by the old method of volunteer assistance—at their own expense, with the entire collective; a bridge had once been here, but it had washed away. The bridge was half completed on the last day of March. Friday arrived.

"On Friday, 1 April," A. Yuldashev, chairman of the Samarkand Oblispolkom, told me, "G. Kadyrov, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, came to us. He and I, as well as the first secretary of our party obkom; I. Isakov, first secretary of the party raykom; V. Yermenko, the oblast procurator; several members of the party's obkom bureau; deputies to the chief of the oblast internal affairs administration; and other responsible comrades went to Dzhumabazar to settle the dispute. We invited village representatives to the sovkhos office for a discussion twice. But they refused, and invited us to go to them, gathered on the bank of the canal..."

"We left for the Dargom," I. Isakov said, "and over 300 persons were already waiting for us there. We started to speak to them—the obkom first secretary, the oblispolkom chairman, the oblast procurator and I. We tried to persuade the villagers to release the "Almazar" land and stop building the bridge, and we warned them that they would be called to account. No one wanted to listen to us, and we decided to cut the discussion short. We headed for our vehicles. A crowd surrounded us here, and the old men were lying under the wheels of the cars..."

"In this way," said G. Gayryan, deputy chief of the internal affairs administration, "the villagers had in fact arrested the head of our government and the party obkom buro, and I called over the radio for a guard who was not far away and set the task of moving the crowd away to the sides of the road to open a path for the cars..."

"Our old men, women and children began asking the distinguished guests not to leave without settling the matter," the villagers said. "We just asked without threatening anyone, but we suddenly saw a detachment of militiamen in helmets carrying shields and batons advancing toward us. They pounced on us, and someone shouted: 'Ur!'"

"What is that, something like 'Hurrah'?" I asked.

No, by no means. It is common knowledge that "ura" expresses either a call to attack or a feeling of happiness, triumph, or final salutation. "Ur" in Uzbek means one thing: "Hit!" A hail of stones from the roadside were thrown into the air. The sound of the cars' windows being smashed was heard and blood was spilled (as a result 14 militiamen were bodily injured; three were seriously wounded and hospitalized)...

"Right here I ordered the militia to stop all actions, and they stopped them," the head of the republic government said, "and the hail of stones stopped. Once again we got out of the vehicles and continued the discussion..."

Evening was approaching and it began to drizzle. Two women took the chairman of the Council of Ministers under the roof of a nearby field camp.

"The villagers would not let us go," the oblispolkom chairman continued. "They demanded that we give them a document."

"On the return of their land?" I asked.

"No, they demanded that the 'Leninabad' and the 'Almazar' be combined into one farm, or else they would not let us go, they said. I offered to give them a receipt, and members of the party obkom buro supported me. The villagers demanded that the receipt be witnessed by the chairman of the Council of Ministers, and he witnessed it. There was applause, and the people finally made way, allowing us to pass through..."

The village of Dzhumabazar is very old; it received its name from the fairs here where peasants from the vicinity would gather on Fridays. Now the local market is open for the fairs on Sundays, but for the residents of Dzhumabazar, Friday continues to be "their" day. The Friday of 1 April described above will enter the village's centuries-old history as a special day. This day, after the applause was over, left its mark on the following Saturday and Sunday as well: the villagers enthusiastically finished building the bridge.

Then Monday came—inevitably. The Law had come.

On the morning of Monday, 4 April (the time for a response from the head of the republic's government had expired, but the time had not expired for...), a column of vehicles, including fire engines, advanced toward the bridge across the canal—"the people's structure"—from the "Almazar" side. The militia was stepping on the bank which the Dzhumabazar villagers longed for so much. A crowd of old men and women stepped onto the nearly completed bridge. A person came from the side with the militia (I saw this scene, recorded on videotape) and passed a paper to the old people... The people did not leave the bridge... Then militiamen with police dogs came up on the bridge toward them (I also saw this)...

The officials pulled down the bridge with the aid of a tractor and steel cable. And later in the village, there was an action during which the kindergarten teacher's husband "moved into a tree to live"... According to a report which the oblast procurator and I received, because of violations of public order and resistance to militia employees on Friday, 1 April, criminal proceedings were instituted the next day by the oblast procurator's office and an operational group of 38 investigators was formed.

"Over 200 witnesses, suspects and victims," I am quoting from the report, "were brought in for questioning and interrogation and to ascertain the basic participants, organizers and instigators of the actions of outrage, violence and hooliganism; individuals were identified and confronted, and forensic medical examinations were ordered... Thirty-eight persons who were identified by witnesses and victims as the most active participants in the events were detained (were there as many investigators as detainees?—S. P.) Administrative punishment for petty hooliganism was assigned as follows:

—42 persons were arrested for 15 days;

—16 persons were arrested for 10 days;

—54 persons were sentenced to 2 months of correctional work with 20 percent of their wages deducted;

—99 persons were fined 50 rubles; and

—88 persons were officially warned that violation of the law and antisocial conduct cannot be tolerated."

By 18 May, the day this report was received, 19 criminal cases involving 19 persons had been processed and approved bills of indictment had been sent to the people's courts for review. The law was in a hurry...

The old men, retired teacher Sherbabayev and disabled veteran Toshov, were sitting in PRAVDA's lobby at this time, not suspecting that they had been "declared under investigation." The old men had brought the note in Uzbek, which had been solemnly certified in Russian amidst the applause; its author later translated the text for me in Samarkand: "The 'Leninabad' and 'Almazar' Sovkhozes will be combined into one sovkhoz." The old men, I recall, also mentioned some kind of "dishonest letter" from G. Kadyrov. (The "paper" which the militiamen had passed to the people on the bridge on 4 April turned out to be that letter.)

In fact, after returning to Tashkent from Samarkand, G. Kadyrov, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, "consulted with a number of comrades the next day" and "then did not sleep all night," as he himself told me, and by morning he decided to send the regular "messengers" of Dzhumabazar (in this case, the "instigators") a letter in his own name. He warned them officially "about their personal responsibility" and said that their further "actions cannot be tolerated." As far as the receipt on combining the two farms is concerned, it is "invalid, since it has no legal force and was produced as the result of crude pressure and coercion against the managers of soviet organs."

The 1 April incident, he said, was a trick—nothing more...

"But what else was to be done?" G. Kadyrov asked me. "The situation was becoming more and more complicated: the people from the 'Almazar' had taken up their hoes..."

I do not know, I have never been the head of a government, and evidently, if stones had been raining down on my head and someone had pointed two fingers in my eyes with the threat: "Kuzingni uyib olaman!" ("I'll put out your eyes"), and this had been on 1 April, I would feel at that moment just as any other person might and should feel. But I know precisely that later, whether in Tashkent or Moscow, I would not have been able to arrive at a "dishonest letter" in one or two nights. But if in the final analysis I had come to that, I would have been deprived of sleep completely, because no one may or should write "dishonest letters," even if the circumstances and a situation that has objectively taken shape prompt us to do this.

So the author of these lines, some reader will say, also stands in the ranks of the "instigators" and excuses those who have picked up or will pick up a stone. No, I do not excuse them. I do not advocate violence in any form: we in our society are obliged to resolve and are capable of resolving the most difficult problem without resorting to excesses—we are not living in the Stone Age. But on the other hand, I cannot agree with those who push persons there one way or another.

"The 'Almazar' people took up their hoes..." In fact, (I was on the other side of the Dargom Canal from the Dzhumabazar villagers as well), the management of the "Almazar" Sovkhoz, and then the field crop brigade that was working the former lands of the "Leninabad" Sovkhoz, vigorously opposed yielding to the former proprietors by any means. The persons here were heated as well.

Meanwhile, the problem is not so complicated. On the other side of the canal from the "Almazar," after meeting at the field camp (where the memorable receipt was obtained by the Dzhumabazar villagers) with a group of "Leninabad" workers, I asked whether they needed the land on the opposite side, and brigade leader Sh. Rakhmanov responded, with the full agreement of his comrades:

"No, we do not need it, we have a great deal of work without it."

It turns out that there is still a great deal of fallow land in the "Leninabad" Sovkhoz which is waiting to be plowed and developed, and even the land that has been developed still needs a great deal of work—it is yielding poor harvests at present. If more work and thought are invested in it, it will feed many additional people. In Samarkandskiy Rayon itself, it turns out that the Sovkhoz imeni 50th Anniversary of the USSR is "fallow"; its manager, S. Nazarov, said once:

"I can accept 200 families after the land has been assigned to them."

So what is holding things up? Why destroy bridges? Isn't it simpler to question the residents of the "unpeaceful village" by name and those who really do not have enough land and work, or to suggest that they move to Amur Oblast, with which Samarkand Oblast has an agreement and obligation to resettle 90 families, or not so far away, to the farm of the same S. Nazarov, which has "few people?" Suggest and help, using economic levers...

The buro of the Samarkand party obkom punished a number of the comrades responsible for what took place in Dzhumabazar, and it has worked out and adopted an extensive program of activity to restore peaceful conditions in the village. Why were none of the responsible officials not punished before, but only the ordinary people were refused: not possible, not possible?... Why was there no thoughtful, continuous party work with the simple people in the village before (and there is essentially none even now)? There is no question that it requires continuing efforts and energy from the local organs of leadership. But the sun is so warm and the lamb is bleating so sweetly—until there are concerns about the people here... It is simpler, after all, to send a punitive detachment, inflict mass "corporal punishment" on the village, and bring it to its knees. And they did, incidentally; I saw a letter signed by many hundreds of Dhumabazar residents in which they asked the authorities for forgiveness and promised to work well.

I do not know how much the authorities will forgive them. I know something else: a worker brought to his knees is not a good worker, as a rule...

I was deeply saddened as I stood on the bank of the Dargom Canal. On one side of the canal, people were working in the fields, and on the other side, there were people. Ordinary village workers, separated and deprived... Who will build bridges between them and how—the bridges of the friendship that has not existed and good-neighborliness? Who will build bridges of trust among those who have been arrested, the bridges of trust lost in their leaders, and how?

The report of procurator V. Yermenko notes that bodily injuries were received by militiamen on 1 April. It also said that "there were no victims among the population." It depends how the term "victim" is interpreted. The militiamen (I sincerely sympathize with them) were given medical assistance, and the same deputy chief of the UVD, G. Gayryan, who was one of three hospitalized, now considers his wound to be "a scratch." The wound inflicted later on 10th-grader Nigora will fester for a long time. The wounds of others probably will never heal.

Specifically here, I mean M. Murodov, a worker in the "Leninabad" Sovkhoz, his son Mekhmona, and their daughter-in-law and mother of three, Matlyuba. They complained to me in the village that their son, brother, and husband Akbar, if not "killed by the militia," had "killed himself in order not to be caught alive." Which-ever it was, murder or suicide, the person is not among the living. There is a widow and three orphans.

What is the matter, Comrade Procurator, is the law slow in this case? Or is it effective and irreversible only on one side? Or is a human life worth nothing as before, during the times that are still forgotten?

I am not in a position to respond to all the questions asked by Dzhumabazar today. However, to regenerate society, which we have undertaken to do so zealously now, on lies, fear, and blood is immoral. There is no point to it, because you will not sail anywhere at all on these whales.

8936

Uzbek Writers' Union Issues Appeal for Water Conservation

*18300348a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
25 Jun 88 p 1*

[Appeal signed by the Uzbek Writers' Union's Public Committee for Saving the Aral: "Water Is Life for the Aral: An Appeal to Farmers, All Working People and the Public of Uzbekistan"]

[Text] Dear fellow countrymen and friends!

Every one of us knows, of course, the sort of threat that hangs over the Aral Sea and its adjoining regions. As a result of the thoughtless intrusion of man into nature, irresponsible economic management aimed at short-term successes, voluntaristic decisions and ill-considered projects, this unique body of water—the priceless pearl of Central Asia—finds itself on the brink of ruin.

In the past quarter of a century, for the aforementioned reasons alone, the sea's surface area and volume of water have shrunk by nearly half; the level of the Aral has declined by 13 meters, and the shoreline has receded 70 to 80 km. The Aral Sea has completely lost its significance for the fishing industry and transportation, irreparable damage has been done to the flora and fauna of the coastal zone, and the region's climate has already undergone significant changes.

All this provides full grounds for considering the Aral and the Aral region an ecological disaster. And the Aral's tragedy must not be evaluated only by the yardsticks of ecology—to no less an extent, it includes socioeconomic, political and, finally, moral problems!

The desert of salt and sand that has formed on the dried-up seabed is doing tremendous damage to farming and animal husbandry in nearby regions. Jobs are being lost, fishing villages are being deserted, and a forced exodus of the population from inhabited places is occurring.

Such is the harsh truth.

This truth obliges us also to mention the fact that in recent times a number of important government decisions have been taken aimed at fundamentally improving the ecological, socioeconomic and sanitation situation in the Aral region. At the present time a great deal of purposeful work is being done to work out a set of priority measures for the all-round improvement of the situation in the region.

However, the saving of the Aral does not depend solely on officials at various levels. The Aral Sea is our common property, our common national pride. And the concern for preserving the wonder that nature has given us for future generations should also be common.

We call on all the working people of Uzbekistan's villages and cities to join in the most active struggle for saving the unique body of water! Literally every person can realistically do a great deal toward this end.

We appeal to workers in the republic's agroindustrial complex to move, finally, from words to deeds and make the necessary changes in the structure of farming in various regions of the republic, changes necessitated by life itself! In zones with a critical ecological situation, it is necessary to introduce the sort of agricultural crops and techniques for cultivating them that will make it possible to save water—the great and precious resource of the people. Water that may reach the Aral! Scientists have calculated that rationalizing the structure of farming on the lower reaches of the Amu Darya and Syr Darya alone will make it possible to free at least seven cubic meters of moisture a year for the sea.

We call on all the irrigation and land-reclamation workers in the republic and all employees of water-management organizations to turn to the Aral's needs and problems, and to do everything possible and everything in their power to put an end to the barbarous attitude toward irrigation and the squandering of precious moisture!

A great deal along these lines can be done right now, today, without putting off this extremely important matter for another day or another hour, and without any substantial material, technical or human resources.

It is necessary to close, without delay, every possible channel for the loss of water, to turn existing drainage ditches and waste-water collectors toward the Aral, and to return to the Aral what is now being discharged into the

Sarykamys, Arnasay and other drainless pits. An exacting and intelligent look should be taken at the **advisability of preserving many plains reservoirs**, retaining only those that are essential for irrigated farming.

It is necessary to begin, without delay and without losing a minute, reconstruction of the irrigation and land-reclamation system, to begin, first and foremost, the lining of main and intrafarm canals, in order to fully eliminate losses through seepage. They amount to many cubic kilometers of water. They must be saved and returned to the Aral!

The time has come for the watering of farm crops on irrigated fields—a long and highly water-intensive period. It is necessary from the very outset to make intelligent use of the so-called excess flow of the great Central Asian rivers, for which the periodically repeated high-water phase has now arrived. **In no case must a return to the criminal practice of past years, when excess moisture was wastefully discharged into storage basins, be allowed!** This will make it possible to provide the Aral with an additional 10-15 cubic kilometers of water that it so greatly needs.

We appeal to the glorious detachment of the republic's irrigation workers to save precious moisture everywhere and in every way! Can we possibly tolerate a situation in which up to 15,000 cubic meters of water is used per single hectare of cotton field over the course of a year, which greatly exceeds the scientifically substantiated norm, and even 45,000 to 50,000 cubic meters or more is used per hectare of rice? There's the water taken from the Aral!

We call on scientists, specialists and all the republic's engineering and technical personnel to boldly, consistently and persistently work to introduce into agricultural and industrial production water-saving technologies and recycling water-use systems that will make it possible to utilize every cubic meter of moisture carefully and frugally.

We appeal to municipal-service workers and all residents of cities and workers' settlements to use water frugally for household needs. Save it for the Aral Sea!

In the campaign to save the sea and the entire Aral region, Uzbekistan's Pioneers and schoolchildren can do a very great deal. Let the "Blue Patrols," which are taking part in the campaign for the preservation and purity of the republic's large and small rivers and other bodies of water, grow and gather strength!

We ask workers in the mass media, on newspaper and magazine pages and television and radio broadcasts, to establish permanent rubrics and sections where they regularly, widely and vividly report the struggle of the republic's working people to save the Aral and the Aral region, demonstrate proven advanced practices for water

conservation and economical water use, and sharply criticize water wasters and everyone and everything that interferes with attainment of the common, humane goal.

After all, implementation of just the aforementioned nature- and water-conservation measures, which require no self-restrictions on anyone's part and, to all intents and purposes, not a kopeck of outlays, could annually provide the Aral with at least 25 to 30 cubic kilometers of water! That is three times as much as from diverting the flow of Siberian rivers!

We profoundly believe that our appeal will be heard and supported by the working people of all the region's fraternal republics. The Aral Sea is the Central Asian peoples' common cradle and a common, priceless natural gift that must be preserved for people.

The Aral must live! And its life today depends on each of us.

8756

Uzbek Academicians Recommend Measures to Save Aral Sea

*18300348b Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
28 Jun 88 p 4*

[Article by E. Yu. Yusupov, corresponding member of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences, and S. K. Ziyadulayev, member of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences, under the rubric "Sharp Edge of Ecology": "The Fates of the Aral and Aral Region Are in People's Hands"]

[Text] We note with a sense of great satisfaction the growing civic activeness of Uzbekistan's population, especially its creative intelligentsia and the republic Writers' Union, in addressing one of the region's most acute ecological and social problems—the problem of saving the Aral Sea.

This problem also is of great concern to scientists, and they gave it the most serious attention long before the current public wave of extremely heightened interest reached such a scale. Back in the early 1960s scientists warned about the ruinous consequences of neglecting this problem. Meeting with extremely powerful resistance both from economic executives and within their own milieu—there were then, and there are now, opponents of saving the Aral—they nonetheless persistently sought scientifically substantiated ways to save the sea and prevent the Aral region from turning into a desert.

Appropriate allocations were made for these purposes; expeditionary studies were conducted; numerous conferences were organized; and reports and memoranda on the matter were prepared for directive agencies. Especially broad-scale, comprehensive research on the problems of the Aral and the Aral region, in which dozens of the country's major research institutes and hundreds of highly qualified scientists took part, began in 1976. They

resulted in a whole series of specific recommendations, which were discussed with practitioners at special visiting sessions of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences that were held in Nukus in 1980 and 1986 and then conveyed to all interested ministries and departments.

In many respects it was precisely the materials of this research that served as the basis for adoption of the well-known decree of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers "On Measures for Accelerating the Economic and Social Development of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR." At the present time additional decisions are being prepared on the problems of the Aral and the Aral region.

Unfortunately, because of the braking forces, which, as we know, were extremely great in our society, the implementation of the recommendations made by scientists has been extremely unsatisfactory.

At the same time, we would like to caution the public and everyone who sincerely desires and believes in the salvation of the Aral against the overly simple and seemingly easy recommendations proposed by certain unqualified persons. We call on them to reject proposals that have not been fully thought through and to move on to the serious, carefully weighed, businesslike discussion of competent specialists, and to listen to the voice of reason and truth.

Thus, let us fully look the truth in the face and honestly say: What has happened to the Aral, and who is to blame for it?

Whoever is the least bit acquainted with the history of our region knows quite well why the decision was made to undertake the broad-scale irrigation of land in the region. It stemmed from the whole course of the region's historical development and the desire to raise its socioeconomic level at least to average union indices, which represented an extremely difficult task under the conditions of the region's rapid population growth. In order to supply the population more fully with foodstuffs and industry with raw materials, back in August 1982 a special decree of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers was adopted on the irrigation and development of the Golodnaya Steppe; it was followed by decisions on development of the Karshi and Dzhizak steppes, construction of the Kara-Kum Canal in Turkmenistan, and others. A campaign of the whole people began to turn the virgin lands into a flourishing region. And this task was successfully accomplished. In a relatively short time more than 1.5 million hectares of new lands was put into cultivation. New rayons in the Golodnaya, Karshi and Dzhizak steppes, which had turned deserts into fertile oases of irrigated farming, appeared on the map of Uzbekistan.

Over the past 25 years production of extremely important agricultural crops has risen in the following amounts: cotton from 2.8 million to 5.0 million tons,

vegetables from 377,000 to 2,491,000 tons, meat from 178,000 to 386,000 tons, milk from 847,000 to 2,505,000 tons, and vegetable oil from 258,000 to 507,800 tons. In other words, it has been possible to provide necessities to the growing population, which in Uzbekistan alone has increased by 11 million people over those years. That should never be forgotten!

In addition, by virtue of certain political, economic and natural circumstances, we were given another exceptionally important, we would even say historic, mission—to provide for the independence of our country and the whole socialist commonwealth in cotton.

These two circumstances objectively brought about the intensified withdrawal of water from the rivers that feed the Aral—the Amu Darya and the Syr Darya, which naturally resulted in a lowering of the Aral's level.

At the same time, in the course of developing new lands, insufficient attention was given to the reconstruction of irrigation and land-reclamation systems on old irrigated farm land, to increasing soil fertility, and to the comprehensive construction of state farms, where there were great lags in the construction of social facilities—housing, cultural establishments, etc. This negatively affected the efficiency of agriculture. Farming was carried out primarily by extensive methods to the detriment of intensive factors, which was absolutely correctly noted in decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

What conclusion is to be drawn from the existing situation? There is one—to implement as quickly as possible the proposals of scientists and urgent measures that have been tested by practitioners for combating the processes whereby land is being turned to desert. These include, in part, such proposals as the phytoreclamation and agricultural development of the Amu Darya Delta, the channeling of runoff caught in drainage ditches to that zone, the stocking of remaining bodies of water with fish, etc.

And there are also others—long-term and important tasks of definitive strategic importance. They include, first of all, the prevention (at the first stages, the steady and purposeful reduction) of the discharge of water from drainage ditches into the Amu Darya, which worsens the quality of its water, which is specially intended for drinking, and the establishment in that basin of a conservation regime and a comprehensive water use system that will rule out the very possibility of the secondary pollution and mineralization of river water.

Without the accomplishment of these definitive tasks, the aforementioned local, so-called palliative measures can only produce a temporary, limited effect. Both those and other tasks should be reflected in union and republic plans. And—what is especially important in connection

with the interrepublic significance of this problem—they should be included as a separate line in the plan for the country's socioeconomic development for the period up to the year 2010.

In our view, the following measures of a local nature are urgent:

- acceleration of the construction of water pipelines from the Kaparasskoye Reservoir to Urgench and Nukus, with a distribution system extended to Muynak and other cities, and the organization of the necessary water-conservation measures in the zone of that reservoir;
- the establishment by the Uzbekgidrogeologiya [Uzbek Hydrogeological] Trust, outside the zone of the aforementioned system of water pipelines (for example, in the desert pasture zone), of spot water intakes using existing fresh-water and underground sources—artesian wells along the canals and the Amu Darya;
- the agricultural development of the Amu Darya Delta, especially for the purpose of creating a zone of intensive meat livestock raising, feed production, truck farming and melon growing there;

One of the most promising areas of agricultural development of the delta is alfalfa growing, for which the Kara-Kalpak ASSR has long been renowned.

In addition to that, the growing of vegetable and melon crops on the delta—with the production of 2,000 rubles' worth of produce per hectare—is extremely promising on the delta, since the annual per capita consumption of those products in the autonomous republic is presently the lowest.

The aforementioned measures would help not only to obtain high production results but also to produce a socioeconomic and ecological effect for the southern Aral region.

It must be said that according to the calculations of scientists and water-management specialists, the delta's development will require an additional volume of Amu Darya water, i.e., the redistribution of present allocations throughout the whole Amu Darya basin. That naturally raises the task of reducing the development of new lands. At the same time, the agricultural development of the Amu Darya Delta will produce a dual economic effect—agricultural output will rise and, in the second place, the damage from the negative consequences of the drying out of the Aral Sea will be offset or, at the least, sharply reduced. Moreover, according to our calculations it will create a powerful green barrier to the carrying of salt and dust out of the zone of the drying-up sea.

The significance of the agricultural development of the Amu Darya Delta will increase even further with the restoration there on a new basis of fishing, hunting, fur farming and recreational activities—with the establishment of a network of ponds and lakes and the restoration of some of the natural bodies of water using the river water, water from drainage ditches, and return water that will be channeled there.

In light of the deterioration of the climatic situation, plantings of cotton in the autonomous republic's northern zone—Kungradskiy, Takhtakupyrskiy, Chimbayskiy and other rayons—covering a total area of about 90,000 hectares should be gradually shifted to the south and replaced by less heat-loving crops. It is also necessary to restrain and, where possible, reduce plantings of rice, as the most water-intensive crop. Water reserves freed up within the limits of allocations to the Kara-Kalpak ASSR and Khorezm Oblast must be channeled into the greatest possible expansion of feed, vegetable, melon and other less water-intensive crops.

Active steps should be taken to improve the branch structure of industry and orient it toward the production of output on the basis of the processing of local mineral raw-material and agricultural resources. It is necessary to make a change in the direction of labor-intensive and low-water production facilities, especially in machine building, with the establishment of branches of large central enterprises, as well as in the chemical industry, light industry, food industry and other branches, and to expand the branches of the social infrastructure.

The discharge of water from drainage ditches into the river system must be reduced to a minimum and then completely halted. To this end, it is necessary to carry out a radical restructuring of existing irrigation systems along the lines of introducing subsurface, drip and discrete irrigation, sprinkling, and other highly economical methods of watering that make it possible to reduce nonproductive water losses to a minimum, i.e., to eliminate, in principle, the flow water from drainage ditches, which does the greatest damage to the quality of natural bodies of water.

In our opinion, in the near future a set of measures for intercepting part of the flow from drainage ditches in the Bukhara, Karshi and other agricultural tracts along the right bank using a special main drainage ditch, and channeling this water to the Aral Sea and, partly, the Amu Darya Delta, with the use of it, where possible, to irrigate pastureland. At the present time the Sredazgiprovodkhopok Institute, working on a government assignment, is preparing the technical, economic and ecological feasibility studies for this project. Similar measures should also be carried out on left-bank, Turkmen territory.

In order to prevent the carrying of dust and salt from regions where the Aral bottom is drying out and from especially salinized parts of the Amu Darya Delta, it is

necessary for the Institute of Chemistry and other academy and nonacademy research institutes to work out physical and chemical methods and means for fixing highly salinized soils that are unsuitable for agricultural development and phytoreclamation, as well as procedures for approval-testing the most effective method—the spraying from airplanes of special solutions that are capable of entering into a reaction with salts in the degraded territories and creating a solid, nondispersible crust.

These measures will make it possible during the current five-year period to substantially impede the processes of the formation of desert and to avoid large economic losses.

In addition to the aforementioned measures, taking into account the tremendous complexity and comprehensive and large-scale nature of the problem, it is necessary to draw up an all-union special-purpose comprehensive Aral Program in order that its most important assignments can be included in national economic plans for 1990-1995.

At the petition of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Council of Ministers formed a government commission. This commission, headed by Yu. A. Izrael, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control, did a great deal of work and outlined a set of necessary measures. After that, commission members under the leadership of V. S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, came to our republic for the second time this year, visited the Kara-Kalpak ASSR and other places, and once again worked with Uzbekistan's party and soviet organizations to develop a set of measures for overcoming the negative consequences of the drying out of the Aral Sea and the spread of desert in the Aral Region.

The final version of a draft document on this issue, having received the approval of the republics and the USSR State Planning Committee, was sent to the USSR Council of Ministers, and we hope that such a document will be adopted in the near future. Its practical implementation will make it possible to substantially improve the existing situation along the lower Amu Darya.

It was with very great joy and hope that we listened to the statement concerning the fate of the Aral Sea made by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at a recent meeting with Uzbekistan's working people:

"Various alternatives are being worked out for reviving the Aral Sea."

We are convinced that the problem of the Aral and the Aral region will be solved positively in the very near future.

Uzbek Scientists Urge Water Conservation 'Until Arrival of Siberian Water'

18300348c Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
29 Jun 88p 8

[Article by K. Lapkin, member of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences, honored Uzbek SSR scientist, and winner of the Uzbek SSR State Prize imeni Beruni; O. Lebedev, member and vice president of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences, honored Kara-Kalpak ASSR scientist; and Candidate of Technical Sciences V. Dukhovnyy, winner of the Uzbek SSR State Prize imeni Beruni, under the rubric "Sharp Edge of Ecology": "Water Conservation is the Aral's Main Reserve"]

[Text] The aroused public attention that has been drawn to the problem of the Aral Sea and Aral region evokes profound respect for the Soviet person, who so keenly experiences the pain of nature.

The intensive development of irrigation and water-management construction in Central Asia are inconceivable without an increase in the withdrawal of water from the basin and reduction of its flow into the Aral. In the 26 years that have passed since the sea's level began to drop, the amount of output from the region's agrarian sector has increased by 8 billion rubles a year, and together with branches connected with the development of the water-management complex, it has risen by more than 20 billion rubles a year. The Aral's fate was predetermined even with a steady reduction in proportional water use per unit of output—and that reduction has been made by a factor of almost two in industry alone, a factor of 1.5 in power engineering, and 30 percent in agriculture—since maintaining the sea at its natural level required at least 60 cubic kilometers of influx of surface water into it, and every cubic meter taken from the upper reaches of the Syr Darya and Amu Darya rivers was also taken from the Aral.

Unquestionably, in irrigation—and especially in the management of water resources—there have been considerable shortcomings that have contributed to increasing the rate of lowering of the sea's level. After the setting in 1982 of rigid limits on water use, proportional use of water for irrigation dropped overall by 5,000 cubic meters per hectare by 1987. If that sort of discipline had been introduced starting in 1965, it would have made it possible to increase the flow of water into the sea by 100 cubic kilometers over the actual flow.

Those who speak of the need to divert all waste water through drainage ditches to the Aral—instead of filling the Sarykamush, Dengizkul and many other catch basins in deserts are also right; that would provide the Aral with another 50-60 cubic kilometers of water. Yet efforts to

save money and the inadequate level of water discipline in 1965-1982 resulted in increasing the rate of decline in the sea's surface by five to six meters over the anticipated rate.

The Aral Sea, indeed, passed its crisis mark—about 43—after which, having lost its former significance for fishing, transportation and livestock raising, it stabilized in a negative hydrogeological impact, since the whole delta, previously a supplier of water, turned into a territory of growing desert. As for the carrying of salt and dust by the wind, the magnitude of it is relatively small and limited to a zone 300 km from the sea. Moreover, as the seashore has receded, only in the first years was the carrying away of sand and dust more intensive, and since then it has weakened with time. The change in the climate is also overly dramatized. The hydrometeorological service's 40 years of detailed observations show that the raising of the temperature by 1.5 to 2 degrees and lowering of air humidity occurred only in a limited belt of 40 to 60 km in width around the sea. In this connection, one cannot even speak of any global climate changes, since the Aral's share of the moisture transfer above that zone is less than six percent.

The overall damage to the economy and the natural complex of the Aral region in the Amu Darya Delta is estimated to be 100 million rubles. Objectively this amount could have been much lower if all the compensatory and conservation measures that are planned and being designed at the present time had started to be implemented immediately after the lowering of the sea's level came to light. That would have made it possible to preserve fishing, muskrat raising and livestock raising, as well as the whole natural complex of the delta itself.

The preservation of the sea even at existing levels requires an influx of 40 cubic kilometers of water a year—in order to compensate for the evaporation of water from the surface of the sea, which has receded from its former banks, and from its drying bottom, an evaporation which, albeit decreasing, continues to be tremendous. In a year that is average in terms of precipitation, only 5 cubic kilometers of water—pure water, river water, and what it is possible to gather from drainage ditches—may go not to the sea itself but to the delta as a whole. Even during last year, when precipitation was high and the delta received nearly 10 cubic kilometers, the sea's level dropped by more than 0.70 meters.

Attention now should be given not so much to the Aral as to the Aral region, for the negative impact, by and large, is manifesting itself in the Aral region. There is not and will not be a great difference in how far the sea's shoreline recedes from Muynak—by 80 or 120 km—it will exert no mitigating influence on the Muynak area. The intensifying spread of desert in the delta causes

profound concern—now there is still a possibility of saving the floodplain forests and the flora and fauna and of restoring muskrat raising, and remote-pasture livestock raising.

In connection with reduction of the flow of water into the entire Aral region, including Kara-Kalpakia, Khorezm, and Turkmenia's Tashauz Oblast, the application of water in irrigation has declined, and in some places an intensive accumulation of salt has begun. To avoid this when the supply of water to irrigated land is reduced, it is necessary to intensively develop closed drainage. There are already about 10 drainage-pipe layers in operation there, but they are being poorly utilized because of the failure to do the advance work required for their 24-hour operation. An example of a genuinely proprietary attitude toward the land is seen in the work of Khorezm farmers from Shavatskiy Rayon, where preparations are made for closed drainage systems to be laid right on the cotton fields, which has made it possible to lay 46 km of drainage in a short period. A similar organization of work in other rayons would make it possible to construct more than 1,000 km of drainage systems in a year.

A drop in the level of ground water has affected the supply of water to communities in the Aral region: the supply of water from underground sources has not only declined but seriously deteriorated in quality. In order to normalize the water-supply situation, the republic's government has allocated considerable funds for the construction of main water courses to carry drinking water between Tuyamuyun and Nukus and Tuyamuyun and Urgench, with branches running off to settlements and villages. Work is now on in full swing along the routes of these watercourses, and hundreds of cranes and excavators are laying steel piping, sealing it and testing it. It is planned to complete all work on supplying water to Nukus this year and to finish it in most of the autonomous republic's rayons by 1990.

In order to restore the delta in general and that in the region of Muynak, in particular, accelerated construction is under way on four main drainage ditches in Kara-Kalpakia, which are supposed to supply drainage and waste water there. At the present time, the excavators and dredges have been joined by blasters, who are working to cut through the solid sections. By the end of the year two drainage ditches will supply water to the mouth of the delta and the seashore. But water from drainage ditches along the left bank, supplied through Lake Sudochoye, is already being used to flood about 25,000 hectares in the Western part of the delta, where basin irrigation has been set up for rushes and a number of forage crops. The intensive restoration of remote-pasture livestock raising has begun.

A commission set up under the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers under the chairmanship of I. Kh. Dzhurabekov, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, is planning top-priority measures to improve the ecological

situation in the delta. They include the equipping of a dam—for the time being, a temporary one—with overflow syphon spillways to make it possible to regulate the surface flow from the river and supply that water to Muynak and, simultaneously, in order to mix it with the drainage water for the purpose of basin irrigation and creating a backwater effect on the delta. It is planned, further, to create bodies of water for fishing, restore muskrat raising, and simultaneously organize the regular irrigation of 150 to 200 hectares for sheep raising and orchards. That is only the beginning of work, the full array of which is presently being examined and approved by the USSR State Planning Committee's State Board of Experts and the country's government, which was written about in the recently published appeal by writers. But that requires substantial outlays of state money.

The Aral and water use are two interconnected aspects of the single natural resource, water, in the sea's basin: the more water is used, the less of it will reach the Aral. Therefore, we wholly and fully support the appeal by the committee for saving the Aral: do everything possible to conserve water.

During the years since the introduction of strict limits on water in accordance with plans for the use of water resources in the Amu Darya and Syr Darya basins, overall proportional usage of water has declined to 13,700 cubic meters per hectare, while the proportional intake in Syr-Darya, Dzhizak and Samarkand oblasts in the main part of the oblast canals does not exceed 10,000 cubic meters per hectare! That indicates that the irrigation norm supplied to the fields there is almost equal to the biological requirement. Moreover, the republic as a whole does not have the sort of water use on its fields—15,000 cubic meters per hectare on cotton fields and 45,000 to 50,000 on rice plantings—that is mentioned in the appeal.

During the period from 1982 until the present, water-management employees and farm workers have resorted to completely new methods of conserving water: wash irrigation has been combined everywhere with water-supply irrigation, and the "hardening-off method" has been widely introduced—using it, the first irrigation, based on the magnitude of moisture reserves, has been moved back to 10-20 June, as opposed to 25 May-6 June, according to the irrigation schedule. There is still untapped potential: it includes preventing the periods of vegetation irrigation to drag out, carrying out night irrigation, and ending the wrongful practice of irrigating ripening cotton.

Indeed, we have entered a phase of years with increased precipitation. This characteristic of the cycle has made it possible to fill long-term regulation reservoirs and discharge more than 10 cubic kilometers of water into the Aral. Water-management workers will continue to carry out this strategy in the future.

In 1986 a broad program of water-conservation measures was adopted in Uzbekistan. On the basis of this program, the rates of drainage construction already doubled in 1987, and by 1990 they will reach 150,000 hectares of drainage a year. To this end, production of 30 drainage pipe layers and 2,000 km of polyethylene drainage pipe annually has been set up. When the Karshi plant starts up, pipe production will rise to 7,000 km per year.

The introduction of new irrigating techniques was started practically from scratch, but in the first half of 1988 alone they have been introduced on an area of 44,000 hectares.

This is the third year now that the rates of putting new irrigated land into cultivation have been cut by more than two-thirds, and this money has been used to intensively develop the comprehensive reconstruction of old irrigated land.

Using the Syr Darya Automated Basin Management System that has been put into operation, a main basin administration has been set up for that river, and a similar basin administration has been set up on the Amu Darya; they are already carrying out work to monitor rational water use and distribution in the basins.

However, all this in no way means that the full potential has been tapped. Indeed, there is a great deal that needs to be done and can be done if the creative energies of the whole people are directed toward the economical and efficient utilization of water. For only water conservation can allow us to overcome—until the arrival of Siberian water—the constantly growing shortfall in meeting the region's increasing requirements.

8756

Aral Sea Committee Blasts Motives, Veracity of Uzbek Scientists' Article

18300348d Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 7 Jul 88p 2

[Article by P. Shermukhamedov, writer and chairman of the Committee for Saving the Aral; Yu. Kovalev, writer and deputy chairman of the committee; and Doctor of Geological and Mineralogical Sciences S. Mirzayev, deputy chairman of the committee: "Who Needs This and Why?: Concerning Certain Articles Pertaining to the Aral and the Aral Region"]

[Text] The dying Aral and Aral region have certainly not been slighted by magazine and newspaper articles. It would seem that people extremely alarmed over the ecological disaster of the Aral and Aral region would be nothing but glad over the editors' attention to extremely grave problems. But no, the articles "The Fates of the Aral and the Aral Region Are in People's Hands" and "Water Conservation Is the Aral's Main Reserve" did

not evoke gratitude! These articles arouse entirely different feelings and evoke perplexed questions. One of these questions serves as the heading of this article.

Indeed, who needs it, and why—to try to prove the unprovable, try to persuade people of that which it is impossible to persuade them of, and to attempt, in passing, to refute that which cannot be refuted? You read the articles mentioned above and you simply cannot shake the impression that they were dictated not by genuine concern for the fates of the long-suffering sea and region as a whole, but by concern for preserving the “honor of office,” by concern and fear for the people who bear direct responsibility for the unexpected ecological (and is it conceivably only ecological?) disaster.

The articles that have forced us to take up pen are far from the first. They all have one thing in common—irrepressible enthusiasm over how much the “withdrawal of the flow of the Amu Darya and Syr Darya” (read “destruction of the Aral”!) has done for the development of the economy and raising of the yield of irrigated land. Figures are cited that, in the opinion of the people who use them, are supposed to justify the unique sea’s destruction. They pertain to increases in the production of cotton, and meat, and milk, and vegetables, etc., etc. But, in the first place, the articles’ authors prefer to keep quiet about the true cost at which these increases and development have been achieved. And in the second place, the sea’s fate is a grave legacy from those decades that passed under the banner of immoderate praise and the hushing up of urgent problems. Many times a year dust storms have risen from the dried-up bottom and carried tens of millions of tons of earth and salt from a 40-km belt over distances up to 400 km. The damage from this sort of “economic management” offsets the benefits of developing more and more new irrigated tracts of land.

And SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA replies to the Shakespearean question as to whether the sea is “to be or not to be?” with a very precise answer: “To be! If only because local water reserves are perfectly adequate to maintain the sea and the viability of its basin. Therein, we dare say, lies the whole paradox of the Aral problem: the body of water is drying up, yet there is more than enough moisture to feed it. Only it is being used heedlessly, as it was in former times.”

The article cites the following example: “In a little over 10 years, 84 billion cubic meters of water has been used for irrigation in the Aral basin. And idle discharges of water after irrigation into drainless depressions, and losses of it on the Kara-Kum Canal itself (because of seepage through the walls, evaporation and swamping) have, in total, exceeded 100 billion cubic meters. In other words, a large part of the moisture has been lost unproductively.” And here figures are cited indicating that even during last year’s rainy spring in Uzbekistan, in five months alone “more than 800 million cubic meters of excess water was used!”

Yet K. Lapkin and O. Lebedev, members of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences, and Candidate of Technical Sciences V. Dukhovnyy, authors of the article, “Water Conservation Is the Aral’s Main Reserve,” believe that the water-use situation in the republic at the present time is all but “exemplary”!

“After the setting in 1982 of rigid limits on water use,” they write, “proportional use of water for irrigation dropped overall by 5,000 cubic meters per hectare by 1987.” And further on they start to offer “variants.” We read in the same article by the same authors: “During the years since the introduction of strict limits on water in accordance with plans for the use of water resources in the Amu Darya and Syr Darya basins, overall proportional usage of water has declined to 13,700 cubic meters per hectare, while the proportional intake in Syr-Darya, Dzhizak and Samarkand oblasts in the main part of the oblast canals does not exceed 10,000 cubic meters per hectare! That indicates,” the authors write triumphantly, “that the irrigation norm supplied to the fields there is almost equal to the biological requirement. Moreover, the republic as a whole does not have the sort of water use on its fields—15,000 cubic meters per hectare on cotton fields and 45,000 to 50,000 on rice plantings—that is mentioned in the appeal.”

If only it were so! If their “calculations” only conformed to reality to at least some degree! Can it be that the article’s authors are unfamiliar with the figures and facts cited at the fifth session of the republic Supreme Soviet? It was noted outright there that 15,000 cubic meters of water is used for every hectare of irrigated plowland in Uzbekistan! It would probably be useful for the authors also to take a look at the materials of both chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet’s standing committees concerned with the problems of the agroindustrial complex, the conservation of nature and natural resources, which met before the seventh session. The documents adopted at that meeting cite the following figures and facts: one in every five hectares of plowland suffers from salinization (in Turkmenia—87 percent!); irrigation systems on one in four hectares are in need of qualitative improvement; calculated irrigation norms are constantly overstated, but even they are exceeded in practice by a factor of 1.6 in Uzbekistan, 2.0 in Kazakhstan, and 1.7 in Turkmenia; because of incorrect water management, damage has already been done to Lake Baikal, Lake Ladoga, the Amu Darya and Lake Balkhash; the Aral is dying; and the biological productivity of the Caspian Sea and Sea of Azov have to a significant extent been lost.

One can understand and readily explain the position of V. Dukhovnyy, who, as director of the Central Asian Research Institute for Irrigation and a former executive of Glavsredazirsovkhozstroy, bears direct responsibility for the tragedy that occurred and is occurring with the Aral and the Aral region.

But how does one understand and explain the position of the other two coauthors, K. Lapkin and O. Lebedev? Why do they so easily brush aside the Aral’s unhealed

wounds and its extremely grave illness, which is continuing to progress? Is it really true that "the change in the climate is overly dramatized"? And do the "hydrometeorological services 40 years of observations," which the article "Water Conservation Is the Aral's Main Reserve" emphasizes, accord with reality?

The Aral Sea, a giant natural temperature controller, influences not just the climate of the Central Asian region, the Lower Volga region, the Southern Urals, and Western Siberia, but also the weather conditions of our southern neighbors—Afghanistan, India and Pakistan.

Nor is it possible, either, to speak of any "limited belt of 40 to 60 km in width around the sea," which, in the authors' opinion, is influenced by the dying of the sea, without knowing the true state of affairs. We would advise this group of authors to take a trip to Kara-Kalpakia and Khorezm Oblast, and then they would see a great deal that is important, informative and essential in order not just to decide the fate of the Aral and the Aral region, but even to talk about it!

In 1986 in Khorezm, winter first arrived on 14 October, and on the following year it "visited" even earlier, on 5 October. Khorezm residents are awaiting the arrival of autumn this year with great anxiety and are afraid that the cotton will not have enough time and warmth to mature fully. Already ordinary kolkhoz members and farm, rayon and oblast executives are voicing bitter words about how if steps are not taken to save the sea, in the very near future the region's climate will correspond to the climate of Chelyabinsk, which is on the same latitude. After all, the drop in summer and winter temperatures has already reached 2.5-3.0 degrees, and that is a lot for heat-loving crops.

Of course, one cannot help but agree with the article's authors that "there is not and will not be a great difference in how far the sea's shoreline recedes from Muynak—by 80 or 120 km." Indeed, for Muynak's residents "such a difference" is of no importance. But it is not a matter of indifference to them whether life returns to their now-abandoned fishing settlements, or whether their own fish combine is supplied by their own, Aral fish, or they once again have to wait for fish to be shipped in from the Baltic region, Kola Peninsula or Far East. The fate of their native region is no matter of indifference to them.

Everyone understands the ill-famed sentence uttered by Polatzade, first deputy USSR minister of land reclamation and water resources, to the effect that "the Aral should die beautifully." That thought is invisibly present in the article. With a persistence worthy of better application, the authors vividly describe the Aral's complete destruction, which nothing and no one can avert without reckoning with the realities of the present day, with those "figures and facts" that one simply must not fail to take into account in a serious discussion.

Last August through October alone the Aral received about 10 cubic kilometers of saving moisture from the Amu Darya. This year on certain May days up to 2,500 cubic meters of water per second flowed into the Aral through the Amu Darya, and up to 500 cubic meters a second reached it through the Syr Darya (for the first time in the past nine years!). According to the calculations of specialists, this year the sea will receive up to 20 cubic kilometers from its main arteries, and there is yet another reserve in the form of the infamous "natural storage basins" of the Sarykamys, the Arnasay, the Aydar, etc., into which zealous personnel of the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources have discharged "excess" water, not letting it into the Aral!

The article's authors are not thinking about saving the unique body of water. They continue to be concerned with thoughts, plans and dreams about the diversion of Siberian rivers, which they declare outright in the article's last paragraph: "...only water conservation can allow us to overcome—until the arrival of Siberian water—the constantly growing shortfall in meeting the region's increasing requirements." That is why, it turns out, they can dismiss the Aral.

But the region's inhabitants and all of us need the splendid sea that has truly and faithfully served man for centuries; they need the Aral! And they need the former Aral region—rich, bountiful and flourishing.

8756

Uzbek Mine Loses Court Case, Must Pay Kolkhoz for Environmental Damage

18300352a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
5 Jun 88 p 4

[Article by UzTAG correspondents Yu. Kruzhilin and N. Shulepina, under rubric "Returning to the Topic": "The Court Has Rendered a Decision: For the First Time in the Practice of the Uzbek Court System, a Case to Protect the Environment Has Been Satisfied." For previous reporting on this subject, see pages 33-35 of the JPRS REPORT: SOVIET UNION: POLITICAL AFFAIRS, JPRS-UPA-88-028, dated 27 July 1988.]

[Text] The decision of the Tashkent Oblast Court has gone into legal effect: the Almalyk Mining and Metallurgical Combine will pay 94,000 rubles to a neighboring kolkhoz whose crops it killed as a result of pollution of the atmosphere. The court costs—5,500 rubles—will also be paid to the state from the defendant's "pocket."

The litigation between Kolkhoz imeni Lenin, Pskentskiy Rayon, and its powerful neighbor lasted approximately two years. Never before has any of the vegetable husbandrymen in the republic been able to achieve from the law the protection of rights that were violated as a result of a barbaric attitude toward the environment.

How does one ascertain who is guilty for the killing of crops? That question proved to be the most complicated one for the members of the court.

In August 1986, for no apparent reason, cotton plants died on 140 hectares of the kolkhoz land. Uzgidromet specialists who were called in by the kolkhoz members gave the diagnosis: "Chemical burning of the plants by sulfur dioxide and vapors of sulfuric acid." During the same period, at the neighboring mining and metallurgical combine, instances of the unstable operation of the sulfuric-acid shops were recorded.

The rayon procurator referred the case to the people's court of Almalyk, supported the kolkhoz's suit. But for a year and a half judge M. Turdyev, who received the case, did not meet even once with the Gidromet specialists or scientists. He lost some of the proof that had been submitted. After the intercession by the republic press, which discussed the red tape, Uzbekistan Ministry of Justice rendered a decision concerning the preterm recalling of judge Turdyev from the position that he occupied. The voters sent the appropriate materials. And the case was accepted for review by the Tashkent Oblast Court.

Now, when it has been resolved, judge S. Budanova says, "In court the combine and the kolkhoz were not on equal terms. The combine has a powerful 'defense'—a qualified legal expert, the deputy director, and the administrators of the sulfuric-acid production entity, the environmental-protection department, and other services. But the interests of the kolkhoz were defended by its chief engineer and an agronomist from RAPO. The combine denied all the facts. It was only an additional investigation that was required by us and that was carried out by the republic inspectorate for the protection of the atmospheric air that made it possible to obtain proof that the 'powerful neighbor' was guilty of poisoning the fields."

An unusual kind of "pressure" on the course of this trial was rendered by life itself: in was precisely at the moment when the case was being considered that the Almalyk metallurgists again allowed noxious gases to escape.

The court's reaction was not long in coming. Two partial determinations were rendered. One of them was directed at the combine's "owner"—USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy; and the other was directed to UzSSR Council of Ministers. Both high administrative levels were required, within the period of one month, to report to the court the steps that were taken to normalize the ecological situation at one of the largest mining and metallurgical complexes in the country.

"How do you evaluate the results of the trial?"

"As being extremely important," UzSSR Minister of Justice B. Alimdzhanov replied. "This is an official matter—the indisputable and gratifying fruit of democratization and the reinforcement of law and order in the republic. It will demonstrate to thousands of peasants that from now on their rights will not simply be stated on paper, but, rather, will acquire real force that must be taken into consideration. It will serve as a lesson for many legal specialists, especially in Samarkand and Fergana oblasts, where there have been similar occurrences. I hope that it will convince a number of central departments and administrators of enterprises and branches that satisfaction can be obtained from violators of Soviet laws that govern environmental protection.

And this is the opinion of kolkhoz chairman U. Bordiyev and chairman of Pskentskiy Rayon Agroindustrial Association S. Umarov:

"We won our litigation, but there is nothing to rejoice about. It is quite possible that there will be a new poisoning of the fields by noxious gases spewed into the atmosphere. It is time to take effective environmental-protection steps to assure that we do not lose the land that nurtures us. We want to ask the Communists of the Almalyk Combine whether they have read the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee to the All-Union Party Conference. In that document the improvement of the ecological situation in the country is called one of the first-priority concerns.

5075

Uzbek CC Details Plans to Increase Uzbek-Tajik Ties
18300352b Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
26 Jun 88 p 1

[Article: "Brother, You're Strong By Having a Brother!"]

[Text] *The friendship between the peoples of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan goes back deep into the centuries. A new impetus to the development of that friendship, to the reinforcement of the fraternal ties between the two republics, and to the resolution of vitally important problems has been given by perestroyka, the revolutionary renovation of Soviet society.*

Representatives of more than a hundred nations and nationalities live in Uzbekistan. Shoulder to shoulder, as a single family, they are participating actively in the revolutionary reforms that have been occurring in our country after the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, have been preparing a worthy reception for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and, by their stubborn labor, reinforcing the economic might of the Country of Soviets.

The party organization of Uzbekistan during recent time has sharply intensified the attention to the consistent implementation of the Leninist national policy of the

CPSU, to the reinforcement of friendship, and to the development of cooperation among all Soviet nations. At such time the party organizations are guided by the instructions given by M. S. Gorbachev: "National relations in our country are a living question for life itself. We must be as attentive and as tactful as possible in everything that pertains to national interests or to people's feelings, and must guarantee for ourselves the most active participation of the workers of all nations and nationalities in the resolution of the very varied tasks of multinational society."

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, during the days of preparation for the All-Union Party Conference, has carried out a number of measures to assure the further reinforcement of the bonds of friendship with its neighbor republics in Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

In March of this year the Buro of the Uzbek CP Central Committee discussed the status of the relations among nationalities and international education in the republic, and approved appropriate measures to improve that work. Somewhat later the Central Committee had a meeting with members of the presidiums of the creative unions and with the administrators and secretaries of party organizations, scientific institutions, and educational institutions, with the participation of the party, soviet, trade-union, and Komsomol aktiv. A report was given at that meeting by Comrade R. N. Nishanov, First Secretary of the UzCP Central Committee, entitled "Increasing the Role of the Creative Intelligentsia and the Scientific-Pedagogical Collectives in Providing Ideological Support to Perestroika in the Republic." A considerable part of the report and the course of its discussion were devoted to problems of the international education of the workers.

This attentive attitude to international problems is explained by the need to increase the effectiveness of the contribution made by the union republics to the development of the single national-economic complex. The importance of intensifying the political, economic, cultural, and everyday ties among the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan is also dictated by the similarity of the conditions and the specific peculiarities of the growing socioeconomic problems.

Recently the Buro of the Uzbek CP Central Committee adopted a resolution that sets down specific measures to reinforce cooperation and to develop friendship and brotherly ties between the peoples of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan.

It is well known that the friendship between the Uzbeks and Tajiks—neighbor nations and brother nations—has roots that go back deep into the centuries. The Great October, which illumined that friendship with the light of equality, truth, and freedom, reinforced and cemented that friendship and helped to establish between those

two peoples, as among all the peoples of the Soviet Union, solid bonds of brotherhood and mutual aid, and helped to organize the exchange of experience in all areas of life.

At the same time the Uzbek CP Central Committee feels that it is necessary to deepen even more the economic, scientific, and cultural international ties. In this regard the Central Committee departments, the party's obkoms, Uzsovprom, the Komsomol Central Committee, Academy of Sciences, and ministries, departments, and creative unions of Uzbekistan have been instructed to take the necessary steps to reinforce the cooperation between the workers of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan.

Our nations are brother nations. And a brother's strength is in his brother! The friendship and brotherhood of Soviet nations, of all Soviet citizens, is the pledge of our forward movement and the fulfillment of the party's revolutionary intentions.

The material that follows pertains to the work being carried out to reinforce the economic, ideological, and cultural ties between the Uzbek and Tajik nations and the measures that are being planned in this regard.

The party, soviet, and public organizations of Uzbekistan, guided by the decisions of the 27th party congress and the Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, have been carrying out a definite amount of work to instill in the republic's workers the sense of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, and to improve relations among nationalities. Those questions were discussed at the Buro of the Uzbek CP Central Committee, which approved the extended plan for the corresponding specific measures. At a session of the UzSSR Supreme Soviet, a Standing Commission on Relations Among Nationalities and on International Education was formed.

One of the largest national groups that live in Uzbekistan, alongside of the Russians, Kazakhs, and Tatars, are the Tajiks, whose number reaches approximately 700,000. A considerable number of representatives of other nations and nationalities consider the Tajik language to be their native tongue. On the other hand, more than a million Uzbeks, or almost every fourth inhabitant of TaSSR, live in Tajikistan.

The workers of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan are bound by ties of traditional friendship and cooperation, and by the closeness of their culture, everyday life, and customs. Political, economic, and cultural cooperation has been developing and becoming more enriched, and the exchange of experience in sociopolitical, scientific-research, and economic work has been broadening.

The volume of the reciprocal shipments of raw and other materials and equipment between both republics constitutes approximately 120 million rubles a year. Uzbek SSR receives from Tajikistan aluminum, petroleum,

cement, caustic soda, paints and lacquers, and various kinds of equipment and machinery. In turn, Uzbekistan completely satisfies Tajikistan's need for machinery for the cotton-growing complex, and, to a considerable degree, its needs for gas, fertilizers, excavators, and other output. There is an annual reciprocal exchange and reciprocal shipments of local building materials.

There is broad-scale cooperation in electric power engineering, land reclamation, and the use of pastures.

The party committees of Uzbekistan proceed in their political-organizational and ideological-educational work from the consideration of the interests of each nation and nationality, and from the guaranteeing of their proper representation in all the republic's spheres of life. Tajiks, like the representatives of other nationalities, occupy a noticeable plan in the socioeconomic and social life of Uzbekistan. The republic's party and soviet agencies, from the very first days of the republic's formation, have viewed them as the indigenous population. They include 12 deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the UzSSR Supreme Soviet; and 4106 Tajiks are deputies to the local soviets of people's deputies. In the republic's party organization the share of Tajiks constitutes 3.1 percent. Among the secretaries of primary party organizations they constitute 2.8 percent; and shop party organizations, 2.4 percent. Five Tajiks have been elected as delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

The party committees also strive to take the proper consideration of the national makeup in carrying out the cadre policy. In the nomenklatura of the Central Committee, there are 44 persons of Tajik nationality; of the obkoms, 438; and of party gorkoms and raykoms, 1686. Thirty-two persons are sovkhos directors; 283 are school directors; 23 are directors of vocational-technical schools; and 11 are administrators of industrial enterprises and construction organizations.

For the most part, the national-cultural demands of that category of the population are being satisfied. In 157 schools situated in the areas of dense Tajik population there are 4184 classrooms with Tajik language of instruction, with 99,000 students. Practically all the children whose parents want to have them instructed in the Tajik language have that opportunity.

It has become the practice to provide textbooks on an exchange basis with Tajikistan. There is an exchange of work experience and of normative and instructional documents between the ministries of education in the two republics. The teachers' proficiency level is raised in the local institutes for teacher refresher courses, and it is a general practice to exchange lecturers and propaganda specialists. The training of the teacher cadres is carried out on the basis of cooperative recruitment in the Dushanbe and Leninabad state pedagogical institutes. In addition, teachers for schools with Tajik language of instruction are trained at Samarkand State Pedagogical

Institute and Samarkand University. The annual enrollment is, respectively, 150 and 75 persons. As a whole, the needs that the republic's schools with Tajik language of instruction have for teacher cadres are being satisfied.

There has been an increase in the role played in communication among nationalities by the mass information media and propaganda. The KHAKIKATI UZBEKISTON newspaper is published in the Tajik language three times a week, with a printing run of 30,000 copies. The republic's television system exchanges programs with Tajik Television. Programs from Tajik Television are relayed by cable to Tashkent and to Tashkent Oblast 3 or 4 times a week. Concert programs broadcast by Uzbek Television include numbers with the participation of Tajik performers, and the works of Tajik authors are performed by Uzbek performers. The volume of the daily broadcasts of the republic's radio system in the Tajik language is 40 minutes. Editorial offices broadcasting in the Tajik language also exist at the Fergana, Bukhara, and Samarkand oblast radio committees. Broadcasts from Dushanbe can be heard well on the entire territory of the republic.

At the same time the processes of democratization and glasnost have put on the agenda a number of questions linked with relations among nationalities, which, as a consequence of the arbitrary decisions and stagnant phenomena of the past years, proved to be outside the field of vision of the party, state, and public organizations and which, to a certain degree, reflected on the satisfying of the cultural and everyday needs of the Tajik population in Uzbekistan. During the period when persons had to carry an internal passport, persons of Tajik nationality were listed as Uzbeks. There were instances of reduction in the size of schools and classes with Tajik language of instruction in Bukhara, Samarkand, Surkhan-darya, and Fergana oblasts. There was not enough instructional, scientific, and fictional literature in the library collections or in the book trade. Because the technical questions were not resolved, there have been complications with the reception of Tajik Television broadcasts in a number of cities and villages in the republic. Many settlements with Tajik population lack cable radio broadcasting, and there is practically no graphic agitation in Tajik. The ties between the labor collectives and the scientific and artistic intelligentsia of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan are still weak. In resolving the tasks of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, insufficient use is made of the opportunities and resources of the two republics, and little has been done to unite their efforts in order to resolve regional problems that they have in common—ecological, water-management, demographic, protection of motherhood and childhood, etc.

Some of the intellectuals continue to have a certain lack of understanding of the questions pertaining to the historical past of the two nations, and the proper discretion is not always displayed in throwing light on the history of the national and state demarcation between

the Central Asian republics. Despite the existence in historical literature of indications that Abu Ali ibi Sina (Avitsenna) was a Tajik, a number of scientists in Uzbekistan attempt to employ the formulation "Central Asian," thus giving Tajik scientists cause to make statements about the lack of conscientiousness in their approach. In turn, some of the intellectuals in Tajikistan raise the questions of the so-called "assimilation" of the Tajiks living in Bukhara and Samarkand oblasts, and attempt to place in doubt certain historical aspects of the national-territorial demarcation of the Central Asian republics in the 1920's. All this exerts a negative influence upon the reinforcement of the friendship between the two nations, and evokes justified reproaches by the workers.

At the same time one cannot fail to consider the instances when people request the party and soviet agencies to expand the volume of television and radio broadcasts and the publication and sale of periodical, educational, and fictional literature in the Tajik language. Questions are raised concerning the increase in the contingent of Tajik students and the number of general-educational and vocational-technical schools, the creation at institutions of higher learning of departments with Tajik language of instruction, etc. A question that requires more attention is the question of the correspondence of the representation of Tajiks as part of elected party and soviet agencies and as administrative workers to their percentage in the republic's population.

The Uzbek CP and Tajik CP Central Committees are attentively reviewing these questions and have been giving a well-principled evaluation of the existing distortions and errors, and they have taken a number of steps to eliminate the shortcomings that were noted. For example, in February 1983 Uzbekistan was visited by a delegation from Tajikistan, and in March a delegation from Uzbekistan visited Dushanbe.

On 18-19 July, on an invitation from the Tajik CP Central Committee and the republic's government, Tajik SSR was visited by administrators of Uzbek SSR. In the course of meetings and discussions with the party, soviet, and ideological aktiv and with representatives of the creative intelligentsia of Tajikistan, joint measures were developed which stipulate the further deepening of the economic, scientific, and cultural ties and the intensification of the international education of the workers and the population.

A treaty of cooperation was signed between the academies of sciences. Questions of conducting scientific-research projects were coordinated. Plans for joint research in several areas are being prepared: social sciences, cultural heritage, improving the use of pastures and of land and water resources, environmental protection, and other regional problems. Attention will be paid to expanding the exchange of scientific cadres and to improving their training.

It is planned to strengthen the business ties between the book-trade organizations of the two republics and the exchange of literature on a contractual basis. It is also planned to carry out joint measures between schools and to expand the contacts between higher and secondary educational institutions.

An understanding about expanding the exchange of experience in the ideological work of the party committees has been achieved. This will be promoted, in particular, by the exchange of groups of lecturers, and by creative trips for workers at republic newspapers and information agencies. It is planned to increase further the volume of television and radio broadcasting in Tajik, and to build a radio-relay line in Bukhara.

It is planned to conduct joint culture days, literature and art holidays, meetings with representatives of creative unions and organizations, to exchange exhibitions and plays, and to conduct competitions and reviews. The ties between literary and artistic figures will be strengthened, and there will be an expansion of the volume of creative collectives. A Tajik literature section has been formed at the Uzbekistan Writers Union.

In May 1988 Tajik Television broadcasts began being relayed by cable to the city of Samarkand and adjacent rayons, and in July cable broadcasting to Bukhara will begin. There is an understanding about the more regular exchange of television programs between UzSSR Gosteleradio and TaSSR Gosteleradio. The republic's Gosteleradio and the party committee have been instructed to organize regular radio broadcasting in Tajik in the rayons where there is dense Tajik population.

Starting in the current year, the entrance examinations to eight institutions of higher learning in various areas of specialization in Bukhara and Samarkand can be taken, whenever necessary, in the Tajik language. In addition, in the correspondence department of the School of Tajik Philology, Samarkand State University, the number of students accepted is being increased by 25. The production order issued by TaSSR Ministry of Education for textbooks to be used by schoolchildren with Uzbek language of instruction has been completely satisfied.

The ministries, departments, and creative unions at the present time are developing specific recommendations for strengthening and developing interrepublic ties with Tajikistan, for improving national relations, and for satisfying more completely the cultural needs of all the national groups residing in Uzbekistan.

'Popular Front' Founder on Estonian Nationalism, Ethnic Tensions

18000528 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian
17 Jun 88 p 3

[Conversation with Khagi Sheyn by E. Kekelidze: "Control Room for Maturity of the Spirit"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] Broadcasts of the discussion show "Let's Give A Little More Thought," concerning the National Front, have added a stroke to the self-portrait of television journalist Khagi Sheyn—he is known even to the republic's Russian-speaking viewers in this capacity.

Moreover, he is a member of the temporary initiative center for this movement. The seriousness of the movement is indicated not only by the number of people who have affiliated themselves with it, but also by the fact that, today, at Pevcheskoye Pole, the National Front is meeting with delegates to the 19th Party Conference and will present them its list of its wants. The meeting will be conducted in two languages.

[Khagi Sheyn] Why a National Front? This is a movement of the people. Is it really possible not to hear the people's need to participate actively in the transformation of life. There must, of course, be initiators, people who generate ideas, collect information, disseminate it, and represent the current stage of the movement's development. I am helping them with what I can. The temporary center will lay down its powers as soon as the Popular Front, as such, is juridically formalized and approved.

For me, the most important remaining aspect is the following: restructuring, which has been begun at the initiative of the country's party leadership, will not be realized if it is not supported by the people, if it remains the affair of a group of people "from the top." This is not a new idea, but I am saying what I believe. And I think that the duty of the party members who are taking part in the process of establishing the Popular Front lies, specifically, in lending support to the people who are now coming forth to participate in political life, in political activism, and in political thinking, who really want our life to be changed, not in words, but in fact.

A true union of communists and non-members of the party is necessary, a new form of this union is needed, one that finds its origin in restructuring. In this sense, the appearance of the National Front, it seems to me, is of fundamental importance.

During the years of like-thinking, when everyone was meant to have a single idea, when there was no mention of any other social and political movements, the question of participation in them by communists also, naturally, did not exist. The Popular Front is the first such movement and it is for this reason so difficult for some to accustom themselves not only to the fact that it is

needed, and, moreover, that it does not contradict the ideals and goals of the party, but to the contrary. Appearing spontaneously in support of restructuring, the Popular Front reflected people's concern for its fate. Not to permit "brakes" to be put on restructuring—this is, indeed, the concern of every communist, which means that their goals fully coincide.

[E. Kekelidze] In such a case, how do you explain the opinion of a certain segment of the Russian population that the Popular Front is a national front? For what reason, let us speak directly, is there not a massive participation it by Russian-speaking labor collectives?

[Sheyn] It will become 'national' in fact if the Russian population fails to accept it, not having attempted to thoroughly investigate its essence. Fortunately, this is not quite how things are; a process of understanding is going on, the movement is becoming internationalist. Moreover, the National Front is certainly not an invention of the Estonian intelligentsia; the idea of it was born in Yaroslavl and has been seized upon in Leningrad and other cities in the country.

Why is it not being accepted by everyone? Traditional ways of thinking, I believe, a lack of experience in democratic traditions, are making themselves felt. However, to be sure, this complex theme needs to be discussed separately. Unfortunately, the situation with regard to relations among nationalities today is rather strained. How to relieve, or at least stabilize, the situation is a very important question. It is clear that, if these relations improve, we will all benefit greatly.

[Kekelidze] Surely, it is time to begin to think about a systematic program—about what, specifically, should be done to relieve the tension? A practically free vent has been given to emotions; it is time to do something, in the sense, of course, of achieving some sort of positive results.

[Sheyn] The matter here, it seems to me, is that we have entered the field of active political relations, even of a political struggle, very quickly and without having practically any experience. People suffered a great deal of harm during these long years; Stalinism and stagnation produced great misfortune, and it is not so simple to excuse or forget all this, much less to rectify it. At the same time, people see the reflection of unresolved or neglected social problems in their own personal destinies and problems in very different ways and assess the reasons for them differently. We must, of course, try to make sense of the pain of the people, preferably in a correct, intelligent, well-argued, and considered form. It is specifically this experience that is now being developed. But this is not an easy matter. We must not close our eyes to the fact that, today, there exists a real spectrum of opinions—from the conservative to the extremely radical. A true national pride, which has been characteristic of every people from time immemorial, exists today side by side with petty nationalism and

chauvinism, equally harmful forms of distorted national feeling. It would be a mistake not to see this or to confuse the cause with the consequence. The people are tortuously seeking ways of resolving their pain, their future—the future of socialism—and there is no other reality besides the people. Now, the entire people are, in fact, included in social life. All of us must be very patient, must try to understand the roots of the situation, all the more so as this concerns inter-nationality relations. I know of no other prescription. I have hope in the reason of everyone living in the republic.

But in order for both sides of the republic's population—both the Estonian and the Russian, or, more correctly, the Russian-speaking one—to enter into more fruitful contact, it is necessary for them to know and understand one another better. I do not presume to say that everything on the Estonian side is completely correct but, at every meeting and in almost every letter, I receive evidence that, in many things, the Russian part does not understand the Estonian one. There are particular reasons for this and it would be improper to blame this only on people, forgetting that our stagnant political system for many years developed the basis for these misunderstandings and tensions.

[Kekelidze] Strange though it may be, living side by side, working next to one another, we really know very little about each other.

[Sheyn] There probably isn't anybody in the republic who could describe today what the non-Estonian population is—what distinguishes it, to what degree these people are included in the cultural life of the republic, know the language, and bind their own futures to that of Estonia, how they perceive problems which are acute for Estonians, how they formulate their own. Do they understand, let us say, that for Estonians there is no other place on earth, in order to solve their own purely national problems—of the development of their culture, their language, of preserving favorable conditions for the development of the nation. None of the specialists is able to answer this question. Unfortunately, a mutual lack of information, an absence of understanding, and missed opportunities for a dialogue, are transformed into resentment, into national resentment, on both one side and the other, and this is, in any case, a very poor helper.

[Kekelidze] What is surprising about this? The answer to one national question raises another. I am disturbed that the principle that "he, who is not with us, is against us," is, in peaceful life, just as bad for both sides, intolerance of differing opinions, today, unfortunately, is seen in Estonian audiences as well, and also produces a reciprocal reaction, as it were (as is evidenced by the attitudes that have been taken toward the article by Ya. Allik in EDAZI and toward the open letter by the workers of the Dvigatel plant, which also is an attempt at a step in the direction of meeting half-way). It seems to me that this,

first of all, is harmful to the cause—instead of jointly solving complex questions, instead of seeking a business-like resolution of a real situation, strength and energy are being spent on emotions.

[Sheyn] I have already said that I am for intelligent solutions. The united plenum of creative unions has initiated serious consideration of our goals; probably it would be expedient to try to formulate a positive program of actions also for other levels, groups, and national communities in Estonia. We should not fear justified disagreements—a justification is followed by a clarification and I am sure that a platform will be found for understanding.

[Kekelidze] It seems to me that the main thing here is that a majority of the problems are general ones: the economy, ecology, democratization of life... I would like to return to the postulate expressed in the Kirkhov article about relations on the level of the nation and on the level of individuals. If there is—and there is—an urgent need to define relationships at the level of nationalities for the country as a whole, then there is also a need to define these relationships on the level of the republic. Unconditionally, on its own territory the Estonian people have all priorities, as does the Estonian culture as well. But, in turn, they comprise the "big people" within the republic, and tomorrow's realities for us will depend specifically upon them. And, therefore, I think that an impulse of benevolence in relation to the other peoples who live in the territory of the republic would certainly not be superfluous—in any form.

[Sheyn] I understand that you also have in mind an intelligent and rational basis for a systematic program of mutual understanding?

[Kekelidze] An intelligent, rational and humanistic one. There are a great number of points which require simply a clear and precise explanation. For example, the question of Estonian SSR citizenship and of a state language—how will this look? If we cannot be citizens of the country, this means that there also should be two state languages. Stemming from this, there is a whole chain of positions which are of vital importance to people. For an Estonian, to be sure, there are no questions here (if we recall the answers to a questionnaire), but for others there are, and these questions need to be resolved and not buried. There is a whole series of positions which require clarification and agreement.

[Sheyn] That is, in the name of a real reduction of tension, there is a necessity for constructive and benevolent contact. I feel that we have come to a very important conclusion.

[Kekelidze] Precisely so.

[Sheyn] In this case, it is simple; an act of good will is necessary from both sides. I think that this could be a meeting, a conference, a forum of representatives of the various nationalities living in Estonia, which would work out such a constructive platform.

[Kekelidze] And a necessary one, after all, we all live on the same land.

[Sheyn] And to begin with a declaration of the obvious: We are inhabitants of Estonia, of a sovereign socialist state. We are different. But we all live here. There is much which unites us. But there are things which—for historical, psychological, social and other reasons—separate us. And specifically in that sphere, the one which produces disagreements, it is necessary for us to work out a common program...

[Kekelidze] The idea is an outstanding one. Of course, preparation is needed, but the main thing is that there be a desire to really improve the situation.

[Sheyn] So, let us sum it up, in the hope of understanding and support:

WE PROPOSE THAT A PROGRAM OF NATIONAL MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING BE WORKED OUT THROUGH JOINT EFFORTS, HAVING CREATED FOR THIS PURPOSE A FORUM OF THE PEOPLES OF ESTONIA.

13032

Scientists Summarize Moldavian Environmental Issues

18300353a Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 18 Jun 88 p 3

[Article by F. Trishin, ATEM correspondent: "Scientists and Ecology"]

[Text] The ecological situation in Moldavia and the tasks of scientific-research institutions with regard to environmental protection and the optimal utilization of natural resources were examined at a session of the General Assembly of the MoSSR Academy of Sciences and the republic-level Council on Coordinating Inter-Sectorial Scientific and Technical Problems which was held a few days ago in Kishinev.

The principal report was delivered at this session by the vice president of the MoSSR Academy of Sciences S.I. Toma, who provided a detailed characterization of the grave ecological situation which has developed in Moldavia. He emphasized that during the last 10 or 15 years scientists have been actively struggling to improve it, speaking out at major party forums, at general meetings of the republic-level and union-level academies of sciences, on radio and television. But their calls for observing the norms of applying fertilizers, using toxic chemicals in agriculture, conducting comprehensive measures

to protect the soils from erosion, and completely clean up drainage have been heeded by very few people up to now. The speaker talked about the initial results of the implementation by the academy's institutes of the Long-Range Comprehensive Program for Environmental Protection and the Optimal Utilization of the MoSSR's Natural Resources for the Period to the Year 2005. He emphasized that more than 40 percent of the research studies which are now being conducted by scientists of the MoSSR Academy of Sciences are directed at solving ecological problems. A.G. Negru, the director of the Botanical Garden, talked in more detail about some of them. He called upon the scientists to sharply criticize the practice of utilizing preserves and protected territories as places for rest and recreation, facilities for tourism, and for the siting of experimental farms here. It was also emphasized at the session that we need to create a national park in our republic.

Academician A.A. Spasskiy of the MoSSR Academy of Sciences awarded high marks to the work being carried out by the academy in dealing with ecological problems. In his opinion, the academy ranks high in this country in this field.

I.A. Kotyatsy, chairman of the MoSSR State Committee on Environmental Protection, considers that the research studies conducted by the scientists and their constant concern for the state of the environment have not brought about any tangible, practical results so far. This has happened because of the shortcomings in the economic mechanism of administering those institutions which are supposed to solve the problems of ecology. To his way of thing, even the modest allocations earmarked by ministries and departments are only being half-used. These include the most active polluters of the environment—the Gosagroprom, Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services, and the Ministry of Highway Construction and Maintenance.

The session participants examined in detail the violations which have arisen due to human blame in each of the "six floors" of our environment: the depths of the earth, water, soil, flora, fauna, and air. In particular, attention was drawn to the excessively great amount in quarries and stone excavations in Moldavia. Sharp criticism was leveled at the operations which have been started on the upper course of the Dnestr with regard to deepening its bed. Scientists who have become involved in the ecological justification of this plan have decisively rejected it, assuming with good reason that the economic managers are not motivated by concern for the well-being of this extremely valuable water artery, but rather by a striving to cover the shortage of river sand for construction needs. In the scientists' opinion, implementation of the production people's intention, would not bring about any substantial economic gain, whereas the ecological state of the river would be worsened.

Those who spoke with regard to these problems—the chief of the laboratory of the academy's chemistry institute, V.M. Ropot, and the chief of water inspection of

the republic's Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, drew attention to the fact that the republic's existing technology for purifying water does not allow it to be sufficiently freed from harmful admixtures. The question of the condition of small rivers, ponds, and reservoirs. Thus, the administration of the republic's fish industry, taking advantage of its sponsorship by the union-level organs, constantly uses an enormous amount of nitrogen fertilizers in order to increase its gross indicators for raising fish.

Unsolved problems in protecting soils were spoken about by senior staff member of the academy's Geophysical and Geological Institute, G.M. Bilinkis, and the general director of the Plodorodiye Scientific Production Association, M.A. Tsurkan.

The tasks of improving the condition of Moldavia's flora and fauna were formulated in the speeches by the director of the academy's Geographical Division, O.M. Adamenko, and the chief of the laboratory of the Zoological and Physiological Institute, F.P. Chorik. Problems of protecting the cities' air basins were also raised.

In discussing ways to improve environmental protection in the republic, the scientists considered them from various viewpoints. In particular, the speech by the division chief of the academy's Economics Institute, T.N. Galenko, disclosed the specifically economic aspects. She considers that in justifying the production plans we must take into account the maximum allowable load on the natural environment. Otherwise, a temporary economic gain could result in great losses in the final analysis. The vice president of the MoSSR Academy of Sciences and MoSSR Academy of Sciences Academician A.D. Ursul, designated the ecological problem for the planet as a whole a problem for all mankind. He emphasized that all people must recognize the necessity for a careful, conservationist attitude toward nature, which we ourselves are an inalienable part of.

Professor of Kishinev State University I.I. Dedyu and secretary of the board of the Moldavian republic-level organization of the USSR Scientific Research Division K.I. Kozub formulated the basic trends of the ecological education of this republic's population. It was noted with great satisfaction that the MoSSR Ministry of Public Education is discussing the matter of creating an inter-VUZ department of environmental protection.

MoSSR Academy of Sciences K.V. Moraru introduced a number of specific proposals with regard to the ecological education of industrial and agricultural employees. In his opinion, we must compile and disseminate, with the aid of all the mass information and propaganda media, a list of the naturally most dangerous chemicals used for processing agricultural crops, chemical processes which could be eliminated with minimal economic losses. Like other participants in this session, this speaker spoke of the need to provide a broad-based glasnost to data regarding the degree of environmental pollution.

Speaking critically of the omissions allowed by the academy's scientists in coordinating work on ecology was corresponding member of the MoSSR Academy of Sciences P.S. Soltan. In particular, he considers it wrong that an institute of water problems was not established at a certain time in this republic.

The principal speaker and the president of the MoSSR Academy of Sciences, A.A. Zhuchenko, answered questions and critical remarks from journalists.

A resolution was adopted on the matter which had been discussed.

M.S. Platon, deputy chairman of the MoSSR Council of Ministers, took part in the session's work.

2384

UkSSR Procurator on Environmental Legal Actions in Ukraine

*18300353b Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
25 Jun 88 p 3*

[Article by P.G. Osipenko, UkSSR procurator, delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference: "A Sense of Responsibility: How Legislative Measures Affect Improvement of the Ecological Situation in Our Republic"; first paragraph in boldface is PRAVDA UKRAINY introduction]

[Text] **The problems of preserving nature in all its abundance are causing growing concern among the public. A special responsibility has been assigned to the procuracy, which, in accordance with the USSR Constitution strictly monitors the exact and uniform execution of the laws. How do legislative measures affect improvement of the ecological situation in our country? And what is the role played by the organs of the procuracy in protecting the environment? These questions are answered and discussed below by P.G. Osipenko, UkSSR procurator and a delegate to the 19th Party Conference.**

Considerable funds are allocated to safeguard nature in our republic. The legislative procedure has increased the economic responsibility of enterprises for the non-observance of sanitary and ecological norms. The demands made on violators have been tightened up. Undoubtedly, all this has facilitated an improvement in the situation. Nevertheless, the condition of the natural environment still evokes legitimate concern in many regions.

Serious damage to nature has been caused by the pollution of water resources. In 1987 industrial enterprises dumped 640 million cubic meters of untreated sewage into this republic's water reservoirs. There is mass pollution of surface waters by many enterprises of ferrous metallurgy, chemical industry, housing and municipal services, livestock-raising farms, and processing plants of the agro-industrial complex. The most acute situation

with regard to protecting water resources has evolved in the basins of the Black and Azov Seas. The Dnepr, Dnestr, Western Bug, and Northern Donets continue to be intensively polluted.

Procuratorial checkups and the results of criminal investigations attest to an irresponsible and slack attitude on the part of officials, as well as to a low level of performance discipline in carrying out environmental-protection measures. Last year, for example, the Zhdanovskiy Inter-Rayon Procuracy investigated a criminal case involving pollution of the Gruzskaya River. A discharge of industrial sewage into the river had occurred at the central ore-enriching Proletarskaya Unit of the Donetsuglebogashcheniye Production Association. Substantial harm was caused to the water resources and to the fish stocks; a genuine threat to human health was also posed. The people's court found the following persons guilty: A.A. Minin, chief of the main production unit, and K.N. Morozov, his deputy.

Likewise charges with criminal responsibility for the systematic pollution of the Kalchik and Kalmus Rivers were the chief of the water-supply shop of the Zhdanovskiy Metallurgical Combine imeni Ilich, V.N. Redya, his predecessor, A.A. Orlov, as well as the section chief of the water-supply shop, V.V. Krutikov. They were guilty of dumping 760 tons of untreated sewage and 71 tons of petroleum products.

The Black Sea Transport Procuracy investigated the criminal case with regard to the senior assistant captain of the tanker Belyaevka of the Ilichevskiy Maritime Merchant Fleet, N.N. Ovechkin, who was guilty during a loading operation of spilling 11 tons of petroleum products, which entailed polluting the water surface. The material damage caused to the state amounted to approximately 100,000 rubles. For this crime Ovechkin was sentenced to corrective labor. There are quite a few similar examples.

Numerous violations of the laws on protecting water resources has been uncovered by the procuracy organs in the system under the Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services. The largest quantity of untreated farm and household sewage has been dumped into reservoirs in such cities as Dnepropetrovsk, Zaporozhye, Odessa, Nikolayev, and others. Every day more than 20,000 cubic meters of untreated sewage is dumped into the Western Bug River by the Lvov Production administration of the Water-Supply and Sewer System. The situation, which has become catastrophic in several places, has been brought about basically by the extremely unsatisfactory technical condition of the water-storage facilities, their not being repaired in a timely manner, and by violations in their operation.

Serious concern has been evinced by the fact that a large number of small towns and important populated points are still completely lacking in centralized sewer systems, as a result of which household sewage is dumped directly into rivers and lakes.

Last year alone about 6,000 officials were found administratively responsible for violations of the water laws. The total amount of fines imposed on them exceeded 190,000 rubles. By way of seeking reimbursement for the damage caused by the pollution of reservoirs, 377 lawsuits were filed in the amount of more than 20 million rubles.

The condition of the air basins over cities and industrial centers has been improving too slowly. In 1987 more than 11 million tons of harmful substances were discharged into the atmosphere. An acute ecological situation continues to prevail in such cities as Zhdanov, Donetsk, Dnepropetrovsk, Odessa, Kommunarisk, Kremenchug, Kiev, Krivoy Rog, Cherkassy, and many others.

The situation in Zaporozhye is alarming. Every year its industrial enterprises discharge about 300,000 tons of harmful substances into the atmosphere. At the same time many enterprises and organizations are using dust-and-gas-scrubbing equipment at a low level; they are putting highly efficient units and new technological processes into practice too slowly. A number of enterprises are permitting equipment to be operated with the dust-and-gas scrubbers switched off. Thus, at the Dnepropetsstal Plant two electric-arc furnaces, despite warnings from the inspectorate, were being operated with the gas scrubbers switched off. As a result, substances harmful to people were being emitted into the atmosphere. Based on this fact, the procuracy of the city of Zaporozhye instituted a criminal case.

An analogous ecological situation also evolved in Voroshilov Oblast. Here 732 enterprises emit more than 900,000 tons of harmful substances into the air without the necessary purification. A significant proportion of them is accounted for by the Azot Production Association in the city of Severodonetsk, where sudden discharges into the atmosphere are permitted quite frequently. A motion to eliminate these and other violations of the laws was introduced by the republic's procuracy in May of this year in the ispolkom of the Voroshilovgrad Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

In a number of this republic's regions there have been more frequent instances of departmental-egoistical utilization of forest resources. Precisely such an attitude was manifested by certain leading officials of this republic's departments in the city of Kiev when they set aside a section of land in the Goloseyevsk Forest for building and educational complex for the Republican Higher School for Administration of the Agro-Industrial Complex. This led to the cutting down of more than a thousand valuable species of trees, including some 100-year-old oaks on an area of 2.6 hectares. The destruction of these forest plantings evoked a justifiable indignation among the public and sharp criticism by the mass news media. For this reason the republic's government adopted strict measures against the guilty officials, and further construction on this section was prohibited. The

procuracy is conducted an investigation regarding an analogous case of the illegal cutting down of trees in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast. And decisive measures will be taken against the destroyers of nature in the future.

Unjustifiable damage to nature and to people's health is often caused by the intensive chemicalization of agriculture, which all-too frequently is still accompanied by a criminal-mismanagement storage of toxic chemicals. Many such instances were uncovered during the course of procuracy checkups within the system of the republic-level Ukrselkhozkhimiya Association. Thus, in the Novoodesskiy Rayon of Nikolayevsk Oblast more than 600 tons of various toxic chemicals were stored outdoors; they polluted the soil, air, and, when it rained, even the Southern Bug River.

Violations of the procedure for storing chemicals and mineral fertilizers intended for agriculture are widespread on many kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Throughout the entire republic there are more than 3,000 warehouses for pesticides which do not measure up to sanitary and construction norms. For improperly carrying out the laws on environmental protection, upon the motion made by the UkSSR Procuracy, the following were charged with disciplinary responsibility: deputy chairmen of the Ukrselkhozkhimiya Association, Comrades N.M. Rubets and V.Z. Tokarchuk, as well as association chairmen in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast, Comrade A.N. Dobrov, Nikolayevsk Oblast—Comrade A.S. Gerashchenko, Lvov Oblast—Comrade A.S. Oleynik, and Cherkassy Oblast—Comrade A.D. Belik.

Problems connected with protecting nature are constantly at the center of attention of the procuracy's

monitoring survey. Last year alone the procuracy's organs conducted 1,650 checkups, as a result of which more than 1,300 persons were charged with disciplinary and material responsibility, and more than 300 lawsuits were brought in the sum of almost half a million rubles. The UkSSR Procuracy made representations to the UkSSR minister of housing and municipal services, as well as to the chiefs of the Ukrrybvoda and Ukrselkhozkhimiya associations. With regard to allowed violations of laws on environmental protection, explanations were heard from the representatives of several ministries and departments, as well as the first deputy procurators of Lvov and Kherson oblasts.

An important role in environmental-protection activity is played by the mass information media, especially the press. We constantly monitor those publications which report on violations of the laws regarding environmental protection, and we require that procurators take the most decisive and strict measures in reaction to these facts.

Successful solution of the problems regarding improvement in the condition of the natural environment is possible only if there is a sharp upswing in ecological culture, knowledge, and skills in this field among the population and, above all, the economic managers, the formation among citizens of an aware and conservationist attitude toward nature. The well-being of our own nature must become a nationwide, vital matter for every Soviet person.